



R. Myers

Island Carib cannibalism

In: New West Indian Guide/ Nieuwe West-Indische Gids 58 (1984), no: 3/4, Leiden, 147-184

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

ISLAND CARIB CANNIBALISM

One of the legends that spread quickest and farthest, and one of the most difficult to verify, was that of the man-eating men of the New World (Arciniegas 1955: 182).

INTRODUCTION

In *The Man-Eating Myth*, William Arens questions the existence of customary cannibalism "as an accepted practice for any time or place" (1979: 9). He finds no satisfactory documentation or sustained ethnography of cannibalism and cannot "isolate a single reliable complete first-hand account by an anthropologist of cannibalism" (1979: 181). Institutional cannibalism is a myth, he concludes; one which anthropologists, missionaries, explorers, and travellers alike have perpetuated. His skepticism has been received reluctantly but there have been few rigorous examinations of the evidence (Brady 1982).

One "classic man-eater" group he discusses is the Island Carib of the Lesser Antilles, the second New World culture encountered by the Spanish and source of the word "cannibal." This paper provides a detailed review of the basis for Island Carib cannibalism and therefore a test of Arens's thesis in this region. To sort out the problem of Island Carib cannibalism, I examine the difficulties surrounding the issue, the skeptical literature preceding Arens, and the actual ethnohistorical data and its modern presentation, and I suggest reasons for the prevailing uncritical acceptance of the idea of cannibalism¹.

Were the Island Caribs cannibals or were they not? Many authors accepted the simplicity of this reductionistic question and relied upon select, but prevalent European judgments for an affirmative answer (Boromé 1966, Bradford 1973, Jesse 1963, Joyce 1916, Loeb 1923, Morison, 1942, 1971, 1974, Ross 1970,

Rouse 1948, Volhard 1939). Yet major problems cloud the issue.

Chief among these is the availability and use of primary sources. The late ethnologist-linguist Douglas Taylor, who knew the Caribs and the original material better than anyone else, put the situation in perspective:

Unfortunately now when it is possible to investigate primitive Antillean societies we find that we are too late, for the aborigines have nearly all disappeared. Nor can we rely on the early chroniclers of this region [Du Tertre, Las Casas, Rochefort] for their bulky writings are filled not with valuable notes of native "curiosities" but rather with lengthy accounts of their own personal problems (1945: 513).

... the picture of Island Carib society in early colonial days, left to us by the French missionary fathers of the seventeenth century, contains many gaps and ambiguities which it is now too late to fill in and elucidate (1946: 210).

In the absence or paucity of primary data, most writers have relied on sources far removed from the few originals. The problem of source material is compounded because the original manuscripts are widely scattered in European and American archives and libraries (Myers 1981). Ideally one must be fluent in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish, French, English, Italian, and Latin to gain proper access to the accounts. The definitive manuscripts may be undiscovered.

A few years ago one might have been comfortable that we understood Antillean societies fairly well, but that is not the case today. We have little idea how many Indians inhabited the Greater or Lesser Antilles or for how long (Myers 1978). The dates of Carib migration northward from South America have been revised recently by Allaire (1976). It is difficult to tell Carib archaeological sites from Arawak ones. Taylor and Hoff suggest that the Island Carib men's language is probably an Arawak-based pidgin (1980), showing that we are far from certain about Antillean languages despite decades of analysis. Cannibalism is another uncertainty in Island Carib studies.

Even the words "Carib" and "cannibal" have a problematic history. (See Henríquez Ureña 1938: 95-102, for an account of the rapid spread of these words in European languages). Current usage and meaning of these is a result of Spanish errors of translation and interpretation. *Caniba*, *caritaba*, *caribana*, *caris*, and *carib*

all occur in the earliest documents without clear distinction (Salas 1921: 89). The Island Carib referred to themselves as *Kalipuna* in the Arawakan speech of the women and as *Callinago* in the men's Cariban vocabulary (Taylor 1958: 156). According to Taylor,

... our 'cannibal' and 'Carib' go back to Arawakan designations describing some tribe or clan as manioc people. Had the original name been pejorative, as those applied to foreigners often are, it would not have been widely adopted, as it has been, by the people so designated (1958: 157).

Escardo points out that the original distinction by the Spanish between *indios* meaning peaceful, gentle people, and *caribes* or fierce, brave, daring, courageous people, some of whom may have been anthropophagous, has been lost (1978: 245-57). From the initial contact with New World cultures, there has been confusion over exactly who the Caribs, Callinago, Canibs, or Kalipuna were.

There is an absence of a clear definition of cannibalism, a practice encompassing an extremely broad and sometimes ambiguous range of behaviors. Cannibalism can include drinking waterdiluted ashes of a cremated relative, licking blood off a sword in warfare (Sagan 1974: 56), masticating and subsequently vomiting a snippet of flesh (Brown and Tuzin 1983), celebrating Christian communion, or gnawing on entire barbecued limbs as De Bry depicts Caribs doing (1590-95). Accompanying these behaviors is a display of affect ranging from revulsion to reverence and enthusiasm. The practice is categorized as endo- or exocannibalism, or as gustatory, ritual, survival, or symbolic. However, reports of Island Carib cannibalism unambiguously refer to the consumption of large, cooked body parts. In formal terms, the Caribs allegedly engaged in customary, ritual exocannibalism of their captured male enemies.

THE LITERATURE

Dissenting views on Island Carib cannibalism, often disregarded, lead from Taylor, the late contemporary expert, to Columbus. The most impressive commentary on Carib cannibalism, because it is among the briefest, is by Taylor, who emphasizes the Caribs'

virtues (1935, 1936, 1938, 1945, 1946, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1958; Hodge and Taylor 1957). Reviewing accounts of European-Carib contact, he includes Chanca's comment that the Taino of Puerto Rico,

'though most seamen, use bows and arrows, and eat the Caribs as the Caribs eat them.' But it must be remembered also that the opinions of Carib cruelty held by the Spaniards were obtained almost exclusively from Tainos who had been captives among them or who had suffered from their attacks, and who hoped to transfer the white men's depredations from their own persons and property to those of their enemies. Later, independent reports certainly do not vindicate such assertions of Carib cruelty and ferocity (1951: 16).

Seventeenth-century French missionaries got on well with the Caribs. Breton "speaks with unveiled sarcasm of the Spaniards' accusations against the Caribs, 'on the contrary, I would complain much more readily of their gentleness toward me'" (Taylor 1951: 17, my translation). Armand de la Paix, who lived among them about the same time, declares, "'in their basic way of living they are only cruel against their enemies. They are dangerous when they are drunk and they fight against each other, but apart from that, they are a pleasant bunch'" (Taylor 1951: 17, my translation). Du Tertre agrees, and Labat, writes Taylor,

goes so far as to deny that they ever were anthropophagous. All our French sources agree in characterizing them by such terms as: reticent, taciturn, melancholic, fanciful, and fearful, indolent, individualistic, indifferent, . . . given to mockery, unacquisitiveness and unambitious; but none who knew them well accuses them of cruelty (1951: 17).

Elsewhere, Taylor includes an allegorical story told by an elderly woman on Dominica's Carib Reserve about a former Carib chief:

Petit François used to receive strange visits. He told people it was his friends from the rivers Orinoco and Amazon. Once they sent him the smoked haunch of a woman, and another time a little lame boy — I forget his name — to make soup of. However, a priest got hold of the boy and made him baptized; but when the holy water touched him, the boy fell dead (1945: 518).

Richard Moore vigorously defends the Caribs against historical "smears and stereotypes." The usual view, he writes, "*is demonstrably erroneous, and has been used to attempt to justify their enslave-*

ment" (1973: 119–20, italics in original). Johns Hopkins historian Franklin B. Knight seconds Moore's assertion, "... the Caribs received their cannibalistic description from the malicious Spanish propaganda used as a smokescreen for attempts to enslave them" (Moore 1972:vi).

Nineteenth-century scholars reached similar conclusions. American naturalist Frederick Ober wrote

... the Spaniards left them alone for many years, only making descents upon them when they could take them at a disadvantage and enslaving them under an act which allowed the capture and transportation of such as should be proven cannibals. After the enslavement of the rapidly decreasing natives of the larger islands was prohibited, it was most surprising to find how many "cannibals" the Spaniards discovered. I do not think it has been successfully maintained that the natives of the Lesser Antilles were anthropophagous, but, as it suited the purposes of the Spaniards to have them declared so, thus they have remained, with the stigma attached to their name, to this day (Ober 1895: 296).

Justin Winsor, historian and biographer of Columbus, takes a conservative view. "It seems impossible for us now, from so many dubious and conflicting authorities, to reach any trustworthy knowledge on this subject" (1889: 328).

Among the accounts of these early experiences of the Spaniards with the native people, the story of cannibalism is a constant theme. To circulate such stories enhanced the wonder with which Europe was to be impressed (Winsor 1891, in Moore 1972: 14).

In his judgment the Spanish used the cannibalism epithet "to overcome the earliest humane protests against the slaughter of the natives and their deportation for slaves" (1889: 329). And in evaluating Las Casas' view, he reports that "Las Casas nowhere denies positively the existence of this shocking barbarism. One might well infer, however, from his pages that he was at least incredulous as to its prevalence" (1889: 329).

As part of an effort to demonstrate that Verrazzano never died at Carib hands, Henry C. Murphy stressed

... however savage and cruel they were toward their enemies, or, under provocation, towards strangers, no authenticated instance of cannibalism has ever been produced; but on the contrary, the testimony of the best authorities is that they were guiltless of any such horrid practice (1875: 149).

Washington Irving, a Columbus scholar, and William Sheldon earlier in the century also dissented (Irving 1831; Sheldon 1820).

Little was written in the eighteenth century on the Carib practice except by Labat, whose views are fully described below with those of other priests. According to Salas, Juan de Castellanos, a Spanish conquistador, explained the problem in his *Elegia*: "they were called Caribs/ not because they would eat human flesh/ but because they defended their homes well" (1921: 101; Moore 1972: 15).

Even Columbus was unconcerned about cannibals in the journal of the third voyage.

He commanded that whenever they arrived and landed to refresh themselves, they should procure that which they needed by barter, and that for a trifle which they might give to the Indians, even if those Indians might be the Cannibales, who are said to eat human flesh, they would have whatever they might wish, and that the Indians would give them all that they had (Jane 1930: 268).

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

There are so few reports of Carib cannibalism that each deserves scrutiny. With all available data, chronologically presented, I include descriptions of the context of European-Carib relations, a vital and often-neglected aspect of the issue. The lengthy quotations are necessary to preserve the flavor of the original perceptions. The first 200 years after discovery form the critical period of evidence, for thereafter the Caribs were few and their cannibalism was attributed to a legendary past by both friend and foe.

Columbus's original views were all-important in setting the stage for conflict with the Amerindians. On October 12, 1492, the die was unalterably cast. His initial positive reactions to the Lucayans, an Arawakan people, reveal motives which characterized Spanish-Indian relations for the next 30 years.

They are all generally fairly tall, good looking and well proportioned. I saw some who bore marks of wounds on their bodies, and I made signs to them to ask how this came about, and they indicated to me that people had come from

other islands, which are near, and wished to capture them, and they had defended themselves. And I believed and still believe that they came here from the mainland to take them for slaves. They should be good servants and of quick intelligence, since I see that they would easily be made Christians, for it appeared to me that they had no creed. I, Our Lord willing, will carry away from here at the time of my departure, six to your highness, that they may learn to talk (Jane 1930: 149; cf. MacNutt 1909: 18).

And I soon saw two or three, and the people all came to the shore, calling us and giving thanks to God . . . One old man got into the boat, and all the rest, men and women, cried in loud voices: 'Come and see the men who have come from heaven; bring the food and drink.' Many came and several women, each with something, giving thanks to God, throwing themselves on the ground and raising their hands to the sky, and then shouting to us that we should land . . . These people are very unskilled in arms, as your highness will see from the seven whom I caused to be taken in order to carry them off that they may learn our language and return. However, when your highnesses so command, they can all be carried off to Castile or held captive in the island itself, since with fifty men they would all be kept in subjection and forced to do whatever may be wished (Jane 1930: 151).

I in order that they might feel great amity toward us because I knew that they were a people to be delivered and to be converted to our holy faith rather by love than by force, gave to some among them some red caps and some glass beads, which they hung round their necks, and many other things of little value (Jane 1930: 148).

At first meeting, Columbus exploited the Indians with cheap gifts, thought immediately of enslaving them, kidnapped seven, somehow managed detailed communication, and passed himself off as a god. Whether Lucayans said "come and see the men from heaven" is questionable, but in Columbus's mind, the enormous gulf between cultures had been bridged.

By late November, communication improved and he learned more of the area's inhabitants. "In a short time, either by gestures and signs, or by words, we were enabled to understand each other" (Major 1847: 9; Jane 1930: 262).

Indians with Columbus pointed out "Bohio." They said that this land was very extensive and that in it were people who had one eye in the forehead and others whom they called "cannibals." Of these last, they showed great fear, and when they saw that this course was being taken, they were speechless, he says, because those people ate them and because they are very warlike. The admiral says that he well believes that there is something in this, but that since they were armed, they must be an intelligent people, and he believed that they may have captured some men and that, because they did not return to their

own land, they may say that they were eaten. They believed the same of the Christians and of the admiral, at the beginning when they saw some of them (Jane 1930: 180).

All the people who have been found up to this time have, he says, the very greatest fear of those of Caniba or Camina, . . . they, when they saw he was going in the direction of that land, were speechless, fearing that they would be eaten, and he could not calm their terror; and they said that there people had only one eye and the face of a dog. The admiral believed that they were lying. . . (Jane 1930: 183).

On Hispaniola, Columbus found no cannibals, cyclops or dog-faced people, but man-eaters and bald Indians were said to be on neighboring islands, along with hoards of gold.

I did not find, as some of us had expected, any cannibals amongst them, but on the contrary men of great deference and kindness . . . Thus, as I have already said, I saw no cannibals, nor did I hear of any, except in a certain island called Charis [Porto Rico], which is second from Española on the side towards India, where dwell a people who are considered by the neighboring islanders as most ferocious; and these feed on human flesh . . . These are the men who form unions with certain women, who dwell in the island Matenin . . . They assure me that there is another island larger than Española, whose inhabitants have no hair, and in which is gold more than any of the rest (Major 1847: 13, 14, 15).

The quest for gold preoccupied Columbus who repeated his obsession with locating it on the island of women throughout January, 1493.

He called gold 'tuob,' and did not understand it by 'casna,' as they call it in the first part of the island, or by 'nozay,' as they name it in San Salvador and in the other islands. In Española they call copper or gold of poor quality 'tuob.' Of the island of Martinio that Indian said it was entirely peopled by women without men, and that in it there is very much 'tuob,' which is gold or copper, and that it is farther to the east of Carib . . . In some islands they call it 'caniba,' but in Española 'Carib'; and that it must belong to a daring people, since they go through all the islands and eat the people whom they can take . . . he understood some words, and from them he says that he gathered other things, and that the Indians whom he carried with him understood more, although they found differences of languages, owing to the great distance between the lands (Jane 1930: 234; Morison 1942, I: 404-405).

. . . in the island of Carib and in Martinio there is much copper, although there would be difficulties in Carib, because that people is said to eat human flesh, and that their island was in sight from there . . . the island of Martinio, which is said to be entirely peopled by women without men (Jane 1930: 236).

The Indians told him that by that route he would find the island of Martinio, which is said to be peopled by women without men, and which the admiral greatly desired to visit, . . . to take to the sovereigns five or six of them. But he doubted whether the Indians knew the course well . . . But he says that it was certain that there were these women, and that at a certain time of the year men came to them from the said island of Carib, . . . and if they gave birth to a boy, they sent him to the island of the men, and if to a girl, they kept her with them . . . (Jane 1930: 237, 238).

Morison explains that Christopher Columbus had read about Marco Polo's travels, on which he reported the islands Masculina and Feminea in the Indian Ocean (1942, I: 404). Columbus summarized his first trip in a letter to the sovereigns, never failing to mention the region's menagerie.

In the Western part of the island of Juana, there remained two provinces to which Columbus did not go, to one of which the Indians gave the name Naan, where they say that men are born with a tail, but I doubt believe that is there, it will not be long before it is visited, with God's help (Jane 1930: 262, 313).

In all these islands I have so far found no human monstrosities, as many expected, but on the contrary the whole population is very well formed . . . As I have found no monsters, so I have had no report of any except in an island 'Quaris,' which is the second at the coming into the Indies, and which is inhabited by a people who are regarded in all the islands as very fierce and who eat human flesh . . . They are no more malformed than are the others . . . These are they who have intercourse with the women of 'Martinio,' which is the first island met on the way from Spain to the Indies, in which there is not a man. These women engage in no feminine occupation, but use bows and arrows of cane, and they arm and protect themselves with plates of copper, of which they have much. In another island . . . the people have no hair. In it there is gold incalculable, and from it and from the other islands I bring with me Indians as evidence (Jane 1930: 263-265).

After months of exploration Columbus was able to confirm neither the rumors of semi-human oddities nor precious metals, which he needed to justify his expedition. His only evidence was a small collection of gold ornaments and ten captured Amerindians, six of whom he presented to the King and Queen (Jane 1930: 314). He returned to Spain disappointed at failing to contact the Khan and oriental civilization, but hopeful a return trip would be more profitable. Above all, he carried to Europe tales of mythological creatures of which only the Carib cannibals survived his next voyage.

None of the Admiral's records of the second trip remain, but the expedition's physician, Diego Alvarez Chanca, left a meager account. Chanca's letter provides the first ethnographic report on people of the New World and contains data crucial for the history of cannibalism (Ybarra 1907; Morison 1939).

Deliberately seeking the gold-laden islands of women and cannibals he discovered Dominica on November 3, 1493. Finding no anchorage, the seventeen-ship fleet proceeded to Guadeloupe and remained eight days. There the long-anticipated cannibalism was confirmed. Most male Caribs had left to attack Arawaks on other islands, but the first explorers returned with spun cotton and provisions.

Besides those articles of food he likewise brought away with him four or five bones of human arms and legs. When we saw those bones we immediately suspected that we were then among the Caribbee islands, whose inhabitants eat human flesh, because the admiral, guided by the information respecting their situation he had received from the Indians of the islands he had discovered during his former voyage, had directed the course of our ship with a view to find them.

The few remaining inhabitants were wisely cautious.

The result was that none of these men could be persuaded to join us, and only two of them were taken by force and led away. More than twenty of the female captives were taken with their own consent, and a few of the native women by surprise, and forcibly carried off. Several of the boys, who were captives, came to us, fleeing from the natives of the islands who had taken them prisoners in their own country. . . . We found there a vast number of human bones and skulls hung up about the houses, like vessels intended for holding various things. . . . We inquired of the women who were prisoners of the inhabitants of the island, what sort of people the islanders were, and they replied, Caribbees. As soon as these women learned that we abhor such kind of people because of their evil practice of eating human flesh, they felt delighted. And after that, if any man or woman belonging to the Caribbees was forcibly brought forward by our men, they informed us (but in a secret way) whether he or she belonged to that kind of people, evincing at the same time by their dread of their conquerors that those poor women pertained to a vanquished nation, though they well knew that they were safe in our company (Chanca 1494: 437, 438, 439).

These captive women told us that the Caribbee men use them with such cruelty as would scarcely be believed; and that they eat the children which they bear to them, only bringing up those which they have by their native wives. Such of their male enemies as they can take away alive, they bring here to their homes to make a feast of them, and those who are killed in battle they

eat up after the fighting is over. They claim that the flesh of man is so good to eat that nothing like it can be compared to it in the world; and this is pretty evident, for of the human bones we found in their houses every thing that could be gnawed had already been gnawed, so that nothing else remained of them but what was too hard to be eaten. In one of the houses we found the neck of a man undergoing the process of cooking in a pot, preparatory for eating it.

The habits of these Caribees are beastly (Chanca 1494: 440).

Jane's translation is just different enough to note.

In one house they found the head of a man cooking. The boys whom they capture young, they are said to castrate and keep them as servants until they are full grown, or until they wish, and then they make a feast and kill them and eat them, and they say that the flesh of boys and women is not good, nor like that of men. Three of these boys fled to the fleet, all of whom had been castrated (Jane 1930: 318).

These lengthy accounts constituting the bulk of the earliest evidence for Island Carib cannibalism confirmed what the Spanish had been led to expect by the Arawaks. Actual cannibalism was not observed; the accusers were prisoners wanting to please the Spaniards. The means of communication is not clearly described. The head in the pot may have been there to clean the skull as well as for the presumed cannibal feast. The Spaniards took five captives to replace the interpreters who died on the voyage from Spain (Morison 1942, II; 99, n. 17).

By 1494, Columbus had captured more Indians and sent them to Spain to learn the language. The Indians, he argued, would gain immensely from exposure to civilization.

... by taking these people from their surroundings they would be cured of their cannibalism, converted to Christianity, and their souls saved; besides which, if the cannibals were thus converted, the Indians of the neighboring islands, who were peaceable and lived in fear of them would conceive a still higher regard for the Spanish ... The admiral, always dwelling upon the spiritual welfare of the cannibal natives, proposed that the more of them that could be captured, the better it would be, and then, ... he explained that the quantities of live stock and other necessities required by the colonists, might be paid for by the sale of slaves ... (MacNutt 1909: 23-24)

Columbus continued to Puerto Rico "for the purpose of capturing more cannibals" (MacNutt 1909: 24). These predations grew as

in 1496, Bartholomew Columbus sent 300 Indians to Spain as slaves, followed two years later by another 600 (MacNutt 1909: 25, 27).

In April, 1496, Columbus, thinking Guadeloupe was Martinino, the Amazon isle, reported finding red parrots, honey, and wax in a Carib village. "They also found a human arm roasting on a spit" (Morison 1942, II: 183). Las Casas, however, did not believe they found honey or wax, but has no comment on the arm (Morison 1942, II: 184).

The triple theme of gold, cannibals, and slaves was repeated on the third voyage. In Trinidad, Morison writes, "there was usually something comic as well as pathetic in Columbus's first contacts with natives as they attempted to lure the curious Indians to the ships by waving brass chamber pots and 'other shining things'" (1942, II: 256). Columbus, once again, was told what he wanted to hear.

They said as far as they could understand by signs, that there were in that district certain islands, where there was much of that gold, but that the inhabitants were cannibals, and the admiral says here that this word "Cannibal" all there regarded as a reason for enmity, or, perhaps, they used it because they did not wish the Christians to go there but to remain here all their lives (Jane 1930: 280).

The Indians, whom he had taken, told him, as he understood, that the people there were Cannibals, and that there gold was to be had or produced . . . (Jane 1930: 282; Morison 1942, II: 264ff.)

As occurred before and after, gold and cannibals were said to exist in the same place. But whenever Columbus looked, he found only traces at best of gold and spurious signs of cannibals. One gets the impression that the first two questions he put to the Indians were, "Do you have any gold?" and "Are you cannibals?" to which the replies were always the same, "No, we don't and aren't, but you'll find both if you go over there."

The Island Caribs, already expanding aggressively throughout the Antilles, responded in kind to the brutality of the European invaders. Before long, the once peaceful Arawak may have joined with the Caribs against the common enemy (Figueredo 1978). Survival of the group required active physical resistance, a rugged

home base for safe retreat, and a territory which held no value for the Europeans. These characteristics fit the Carib but not the Arawak. "It is sad but significant that the only Indians of the Caribbean who have survived are those who proved both willing and able to defend themselves. The Tainos, whom Columbus found so gentle and handsome and hospitable, are long since extinct" (Morison 1942, I: 305).

One of the major disruptions of the contact period must have been the diseases to which the Amerindians had no resistance: measles, smallpox, and tuberculosis. Because colonies were not established in the Lesser Antilles for 130 years after discovery, no resident observers documented the mortality or morbidity among the Caribs. Along with slaughter and slavery, disease accelerated the demise of once vigorous Caribbean cultures. Despite whatever destruction of Carib society occurred, their reputation as fierce cannibals persisted.

Once cannibalism was confirmed by circumstantial evidence, belief in it became thoroughly entrenched, while tailed and dog-faced men and Amazon women faded quickly from mention or to the interior of unexplored continents. Emphasis on cannibalism served the ends of Columbus to derive economic benefit from his voyages. Slavery became an expedient way to use the new-found Indies, and the claims of cannibalism a vehicle for promoting it. Columbus's approach to the Carib "problem" was one which fixed relations between European and Indian in intractable opposition. No other solution was possible until the Island Carib were subdued by disease and cultural collapse. By then, cannibalism was part of dim legend, or perhaps myth.

Alonso de Ojeda assisted coastal South American Indians by avenging Island Carib raids in 1499. The friendly Indians, who considered the Spanish "superhuman beings," explained that "their coast was subject to invasion from a distant island, the inhabitants of which were cannibals, and carried their people into captivity, to be devoured at their unnatural banquets" (Irving 1831: 18). Ojeda sailed to the unnamed Carib isle, ravaged the residents, and left with 'a number of Carib captives' (1831: 20).

Amerigo Vespucci described the Indians of Trinidad as "cannibals, of friendly disposition and goodly stature." He

created a lasting impression in European minds of savage treachery and located the cannibals in northeastern South America with a vivid account of a Portuguese sailor sent ashore to meet the Indians.

As soon as he stepped ashore the women gathered around him in a circle. They observed him, they touched him. He seemed to please them. Suddenly a woman emerged from the woods carrying a great club, which she brought down on the sailor's head with such force that he dropped dead where he stood. The women swiftly dragged his body into the woods. The men came out with bows and arrows. The ships' crews did not venture to leave their vessels, but discharged four cannon balls, which did no harm, but cleared the beach as by magic. Back on the hill, the women piled more wood on the fire and roasted the Portuguese over the flames with shouts of glee. When they judged that he was done, they carved him up, and everyone grabbed a piece of the delicious meat, waving the gnawed bones triumphantly (Arciniegas 1955: 213).

"It was the custom," according to Amerigo,

to eat enemies taken prisoners of war. After making use of the women captives for a time, they shot them and their children with arrows and ate them at great banquets celebrating past victories. Smoked human legs hung from the rafters of their houses like hams, and they fattened children for their larder. The Christians took pity on ten such tender victims — 'destined to the sacrifice, not to say malefice' — and bought them (1955: 214).

Amerigo Vespucci was a publicist and unconcerned with critical accuracy. He described meeting an old Indian who "indicated to me by stones that he had lived 1,700 moons, which make 132 years" (Arciniegas 1955: 214). The location of Vespucci's cannibal orgy may lie just beyond the Island Carib province, but the event closely resembles other Indian attacks attributed to the Island Caribs and is flawed by similar vagueness of location, ambiguity, and onesidedness.

One of the anthropophagous feasts known best to Europeans concerns the death of Giovanni da Verrazzano, but the details and even the veracity of the story, remain in dispute. It is usually asserted that Verrazzano was eaten by Caribs on his third voyage to the New World in 1528, but the facts are scarce and illustrate the entire problem of Island Carib cannibalism. The earliest papers referring to the voyage date from 1531, 1533, and 1535, but "they add nothing but further questions to the scanty docum-

entation concerning the death of 'Verrazzano' (Wroth 1970: 237). There is no cartographic evidence pertaining to the Verrazzano voyage. "Gerolamo da Verrazzano drew his map in 1529 with no trace upon it of the specific route and landing places of his brother's last expedition" (1970: 236). The earliest printed statement about the voyage of 1528 is the *Elogia vivorum* of Paolo Giovio, Bishop of Nocera, printed in 1551 and contains the first reference to his death by cannibals:

dum curiosius navigando naturae abstrusa planeque deserta scrutaretur, a canibalibus, spectantibus e classe sociis, comestus est (Wroth 1970: 237).

All other descriptions derive from this account of Verrazzano's death, written twenty-three years after it supposedly occurred. In 1556, Giovanni Battista Ramusio rendered it loosely into Italian but offered no additional factual data.

nell ultimo viaggio, che esto fece, havendo voluto smontare in terre con alcuni compagni, furono tutti morti da quei popoli, & in presentia de coloro, che erano rimasi nelle navi, furono arrostiti & mangiati (Wroth 1970: 237).

["During the last trip that we made, because we wanted to land with some fellows, all of them were killed by that people, and observed by those who were left on the ships, they were roasted and eaten." (my translation)]

About 1560 — the date is uncertain — Giulio Giovio, nephew of Paolo Giovio, composed an expanded, poetical, general history of the events. It is the "most comprehensive and detailed of the accounts" writes Wroth, who translated stanzas 7–10:

7. Near that place there are many small islands, among which Cabaco and Bahama. Poor Verrazzano was not granted a long life, since in that sea he ran into troubles: he was attacked by people who, always, want to eat foreigners and who are called cruel and wicked cannibals.

8. He turned his ship about and, sailing to the south, he decided to go to Darien, a very beautiful place on land. Sailing and always seeking with his intelligence to discover more places, with six of his men he disembarked on a deserted island which seemed covered with tall trees.

9. They were taken by cruel people who suddenly attacked them. They were killed, laid on the ground, cut into pieces and eaten down to the smallest bone by those people. And there also was Verrazzano's brother who saw the ground red with his brother's blood, but could give no help, being aboard ship.

10. He saw everything and, having later come to Rome, one day he told us, in tears, about this bitter event. Such a sad death had the seeker of new lands (1970: 250).

The barest events have been given body and emotion. The site of the murder is not specified, nor is the context of the encounter elaborated. There are similarities to the description of the murder of the Portuguese sailor on Amerigo's voyage: a defenseless party of Europeans trusting the natives, or the absence of natives, lands and is viciously dispatched and devoured while comrades watch helplessly off shore.

This version of Verrazzano's death was accepted for two centuries until a Spanish annalist proposed that he was hung for piracy elsewhere. Elaborating on this theory, Murphy declared "the statement that Verrazzano and a member of his crew were killed and then feasted upon by the inhabitants of the coast which he had visited a second time, has no support or confirmation in the history of that rude and uncivilized people, ..." (1875: 149). Wroth examined all arguments and evidence; his conclusions are cautious, scholarly, and convincing:

With full awareness of the conjectural quality of this argument we may accept the poem as a probably factual, if not explicit, account of the last expedition and the death of Giovanni da Verrazzano (1970: 260) ... The historian of today may question the contemporary story of his death at the hands of cannibals in 1528 or 1529, but in view of available documentation he must certainly reject the accounts which would have him hanged for piracy in Spain by the Spaniards in 1527 (1970: 255).

Additionally interesting is the way sparse events and conjectures are given substance by a master storyteller, Samuel Eliot Morison. Morison deduces that Verrazzano must have landed on Guadeloupe, "chief stronghold of the Carib and the most heavily populated, where Spaniards had ceased landing after experiences like Verrazzano's" since there "are few places where one can anchor a mile or more off shore, as Verrazzano liked to do" (1971: 325). As he recounts the by-now all too familiar tragedy,

En route he changed his mind and followed the chain of the Lesser Antilles. There he made the mistake of anchoring well off shore, as he customarily did. Unfortunately, the island where he chose to call — probably Guadeloupe —

was inhabited by no gentle tribe of Indians, but by ferocious, man-eating Caribs. The Verrazzano brothers rowed shoreward in the ship's boat. A crowd of natives waited at the water's edge, licking their chops at the prospect of a human lunch; but the French as yet knew nought of this nation of cannibals. Giovanni innocently waded ashore alone while Girolamo and the boat's crew plied their oars far enough off the beach to avoid the breakers. The Caribs, expert at murder, overpowered and killed the great navigator, then cut up and ate his still quivering body whilst his brother looked on helplessly, seeing the 'sand ruddy with fraternal blood.' The ships were anchored too far off shore to render gunfire support" (1971: 315).

There are obvious problems with Morison's fantasy. The Spaniards did not cease landing on Guadeloupe or anywhere else during the sixteenth century because of the presence of Caribs. If the boat was anchored far off shore and it was at Guadeloupe, breakers on the Carribean shore would be highly unlikely. Morison speculates that both brothers went ashore and that they went unarmed. "Licking their chops" and "quivering body" are blatant embellishments. Thus an event which went unmentioned for a generation, which may or may not have occurred, in an unknown location, on an undocumented voyage, has been given factual, detailed existence, definite location, and a scholarly imprimatur. Morison's exciting version will undoubtedly spread wider and be quoted more frequently than Wroth's careful analysis.

Accounts of the Island Caribs for the next 130 years resulted from their raids on other islands, from tales repeated by escaped captives, or from the expanding legends of their exploits. Despite periodically violent encounters and the reputation of the Caribs as cannibals, Spanish, and eventually French and English, ships called at Dominica, the Carib stronghold, to take on wood and fresh water and to trade with the Indians. Mention of peaceful encounters between Europeans and Caribs gradually enters the literature toward the end of the sixteenth century.

Although the cedula of December, 1511, empowered all Spanish to make war against and to enslave the Caribs for resisting Catholicism, killing Christians, and "dismembering and eating" their Indian neighbors (Jesse 1963: 29), cannibalism is not described for nearly seventy years. Fleets called repeatedly at Dominica and Guadeloupe, sometimes with loss of life (Irving

1831: 320; Boromé 1966: 32, 33, 35, 43, n.28; Southey 1827, I: 189). The Caribs raided Puerto Rico so frequently that in 1562, its residents declared war on them. The Archives of the Indies in Sevilla contain 130 folios documenting raids by Dominican Caribs during 1558–80 (Boromé 1966: 41, n.11). Yet in 1568, several English ships landed at Dominica and “trafficked with the natives” uneventfully (Southey 1827, I: 192).

In 1580, Luisa Navarrete, a 23-year old free Negress, escaped from her Carib captors. Although all slaves were badly treated, only non-Carib Indians were eaten, she claimed.

Denied any meat save raw mice, snakes or cooked Indian captives, they were permitted uncooked fish, crabs, and mussels. . . . Male slaves dreaded the religious or war victory feasts with dancing to songs (*arietos*), in the course of which one of them would be killed and flung into the sea if European or African, or eaten if Indian . . . Under the stress of slavery some captives went mad. Others turned cannibal and performed the same rites as the Caribs (Boromé 1966: 35).

By this time legends had arisen to explain Carib culinary discriminations. Bishop Salamanca of Puerto Rico wrote

that people eats human flesh and they do not eat Christians as they did before because once they ate a priest and all who ate him died. What they do now is that they use the Cristians as slaves. They make Christians go about naked and with long hair as they have. And since they really enjoy eating human flesh, they go to the island of Trinidad and other places and capture Indians to eat (1587).

As Boromé described the tale,

This indigestion story went the rounds. When becalmed off Dominica and in desperate need of wood and water, the Spaniards took to sending ashore a friar, or a sailor disguised in gunny sack as one, to negotiate with the natives. Whether this ruse actually fooled the Caribs is much to be doubted. They were not a stupid people and seemed able to smell a Spaniard a mile away. Although they dropped Christian Europeans from their diet, rumours persisted for yet another hundred years that they found the Spaniards stringy and full of gristle, the French delicious, and the Dutch fairly tasteless (Boromé 1966: 31–32; see also Morison 1942, II: 68).

Herrera repeats the friar story in 1601, but says they quit eating human flesh in general, without limiting it to Christians, Europeans, or clergymen:

... The men of Sancta Cruz, and others, had a custome to goe and hunt for men to the Iland of Saint John, for to eate, and at this day they of Dominica doe it... Now they say, that within this little while, they of Dominica did eate a Fryer, and that alle they which did eate his flesh, had such a fluxe, that some dyed, and that therefore they have left eating humane flesh (Purchas 1905, 14: 451-452).

Space does not permit listing all peaceful contacts between the English, French, and Caribs, but John White's 1590 stop at Dominica was the usual experience.

The first of May in the morning many of the Salvages came aboard our ships in their canowes, and did traffique with us; we also the same day landed and entered their towne whence we returned the same day aboard without any resistance of the Salvages; or any offence done to them (Burrage 1906: 308).

English-Carib encounters later deteriorated but the record of this period is generally one of good relations, and absense of reports of cannibalism.

From the 1630's until the 1660's, French influence waxes as that nation "planted her flag on Dominica (1635), made a treaty with the Indians (1640), sent in a missionary (1642), and assumed proprietorship to the point of ordering (1643) that no strangers be permitted to settle there" (Boromé 1966: 40). That missionary was Father Raymond Breton, who resided on Dominica from 1642 to 1653, and provided the bulk of the ethnographic and linguistic description of the Island Caribs which exists, as he attempted in vain to convert them to Christianity. Breton had the advantage of reading descriptions by others to whom he had spoken or written about the Caribs or who had been in the islands themselves: Bouton (1958), Armand de la Paix (MS), DuTertre (1667), and Rochefort (1658). When he finally did publish his accounts and the Carib-French dictionary, he corrected wrong impressions left by the others (Petitjean-Roget 1963; Rennard 1929, 1935).

In 1640, Jacques Bouton wrote the earliest account of the French in Martinique, another island home of Caribs south of Dominica. He lacked firsthand experience with the Caribs and his relation is a classic example of ethnocentric reportage. He describes the Caribs as "filthy," "unfaithful," and "extremely sloth-

ful." They "go entirely naked without shame" and have a "ridiculous ceremony at the birth of their children" (1958: 3).

They kill and eat their captives with a thousand ceremonies and cruelties, however not so extreme as those of the Canadians. They sometimes preserve a hand of the dead enemy which they carry in triumph and dance all about with it (1958: 7).

Armand de la Paix worked with Breton on Dominica. He knew the "cannibals" personally, but his accounts leave the blurred impression of one describing hearsay as fact.

The result is that now they only rarely show mercy to male slaves, but rather they kill and eat them . . . One of the natives of Dominica told Father Raymond of a raid in which they captured a large number of Negroes and butchered one of our Fathers and smoked him to eat, but he had aroused in them such a reluctance that they never dared eat him. The narrator affirmed that he was one of those present at that occasion. For sometime now they have abstained from eating the flesh of Christians . . . After the combat, they pillage thoroughly. If there are any dead enemies, they eat the arms and feet, and smoke the rest for their return home . . . After beating a captive to death, they cut him into pieces and eat part of him at that time. Each one carries a piece home which he eats with his family in great solemnity (Breton & La Paix HRAF ST 13, 1: 3, 23; cf. Rennard 1929).

This has the persuasiveness of observation, but nowhere does La Paix say he saw it himself.

Raymond Breton was fond of the people among whom he spent so many years. He reports seemingly incontrovertible evidence of Carib cannibalism.

They kill their prisoners with blows of clubs. If some of the prisoners are women they take them home and give them to the old men as wives and slaves. If they capture male children they regard them as slaves, but if the males are older they force them to fast, because the Caribs do not like to eat fat, and then they kill them . . . All their harangues, which they make so frequently, are only war speeches to excite themselves against their enemies. Even the human flesh they eat *at this time* is for the same purpose, because they eat it in such small quantities. However, *I think* that when they have it in large quantities they eat all they can, because *I heard it said* here that when they killed three of our missionaries at Puerto Rico they smoked them. But during the meal they became so greatly disgusted that they dared not look at them . . . When they are going to eat an Arawak there is singing, dancing and rejoicing. At the beginning of my stay in Dominica, my host, Captain Baron, had killed and brought back an Arawak from South America. He had a great drinking party and invited anyone who wished to come. He gave each woman a part of the

Arawak to cook in her own pot so that she should eat it with her husband and family who were in the assembly. This they did with great enjoyment during the day. After having drunk and been entertained in their harangues concerning their valor, as night fell they were reeling and their eyes rolled in their heads. They began to sing and dance and howled with such fury and hatred that I was completely terrified.

If there is anything capable of saddening the Caribs it would be not being able to kill an Arawak, because they can neither become captains nor be respected except by this feat towards which all their thoughts are directed and channeled. The Arawaks are their chief enemies towards whom they are relentless and for whom they want to be living tombs [i.e. whom they want to eat alive.]

I think that when they catch them they do not change their attitude; they enslave only the women and children (Breton 1665, HRAF ST 13; 2: 13-14, *italics added*).

This selection is the only reliable, first-hand description of Carib cannibalism in the entire literature and cannot be dismissed. Several problems remain, however. Breton clearly implies, but does not claim explicitly, that he saw what he describes. He writes, "I think" and "I heard it said" about the situations in which the Caribs supposedly ate "large quantities" of flesh. The "small quantities" of flesh eaten "at this time" may refer not to the present, but to the general situation described above. The only occasion at which he claims to have been present was soon after he arrived in Dominica and he was "terrified". The scene Breton describes contrasts with the "great solemnity" of Armand de la Paix, as well as with the mention of castrating and fattening youths by Chanca and Amerigo Vespucci. There is enough blurring between oral tradition and eye-witnessed events to make Breton's description less than totally convincing. There is no distinction between hearsay and the ethnographic present.

The historian Jean Baptiste DuTertre gives an even fuller account, but his source of information was Breton.

When there are enemy dead on the ground they are barbecued, that is to say roasted until they are dry, and then eaten immediately. The male captives are brought home in triumph. They are starved and a general assembly is held, the captives being displayed tied up rightly . . . The prisoners even defy their captors by boasting loudly that they have eaten the fathers of the conquerors, and tell them that they [the conquerors] will be eating their own fathers when they eat the prisoners. They add that their own relatives and friends will know how to revenge their death . . .

After the prisoners are killed the captors dismember them, cutting up the

meat with knives and the bones with billhooks. They throw the limbs on a large barbecue over a blazing fire. . . . After this good meat is cooked the bravest roast the heart and eat it. The women's share is the legs and thighs. The others eat the other parts indifferently. The meat is eaten with fury rather than with pleasure, through revenge rather than to feed themselves. They do not enjoy its taste, for most of them become sick after this terrible meal. It is a fantastic and amazing sight to see the madness or more exactly fury of the women while eating the flesh of their enemies. They chew it, chew it again, tighten it between their teeth and are so afraid to lose a morsel that they lick the grill sticks on which some spots of grease have fallen.

When everyone in the assembly has eaten the meat, each one carries some home with him to eat at another time. While I was in Martinique I saw a Carib carry a roasted leg into a house, the leg being as dry and hard as wood. He invited each one to join him. He said that those who had eaten some Allouague — for this is what he called his cooked meat — would become very courageous. Among the Caribs those who have eaten the most are the most respected.

The Caribs have tasted men from every nation that has visited them. I have heard them say several times that among all the Christians, the French were the best and the most delicate, in contrast to the Spaniards who were so tough that the Caribs had difficulty eating them. A little time prior to the occupation of St. Kitts by the French, the Caribs raided Puerto Rico. Among their other crimes they killed and roasted one of our missionaries. After eating him most of them died, the survivors stated they had not eaten a morsel of him. I think they only say this, for the simplest among them naively confess that they devoured him. Since that time they have not eaten any more Christians, contenting themselves with killing them and abandoning them where they fall (DuTertre 1667, HRAF ST 13, 4: 37-38).

Several items of interest emerge from this remarkable account. The Caribs eat dried flesh, but they do not enjoy it, as it makes them sick. They eat to bolster their courage and for revenge and they do it with anger. Aside from the roasted leg he saw in Martinique, which might have been a horse or cow limb, everything DuTertre reports is hearsay or oral tradition. He did not say he saw the leg being eaten, which is consistent with the denial of cannibalism by Labat below. DuTertre repeats his own version of two traditions mentioned above, and now the Spanish friar has become one of "our missionaries." He says this occurred shortly before 1627, when the French settled St. Kitts, but by then the story had been around for at least fifty years. As strong as DuTertre's report of cannibalism seems at first, it adds nothing to the rumors already circulating.

During the remainder of the seventeenth century, the French relaxed their missionary efforts and the Caribs and English

became mortal enemies. Caribs from Dominica and St. Vincent attacked Montserrat and Antigua, burned houses, killed men, and "carried off the women and children, ravishing and making slaves of them" (Great Britain 1896, 10: 642). English outrage prompted aggressive, treacherous reprisals beyond the scope of this paper, but there is no mention of cannibalism.

The last primary source relevant to the issue is from historian-priest Père Jean-Baptiste Labat who lived in the Lesser Antilles from 1693 to 1705. In January, 1700, he spent seventeen days with Dominica's Caribs, the most traditional group remaining in the region, numbering 2000 by Labat's estimation (Labat 1724).

It is a mistake to believe that the savages of our islands are cannibals, or that they go to war for the express purpose of capturing prisoners in order to devour them. I have proofs to the contrary clearer than the day.

It is true I have heard many of our filibusters say there are wandering tribes of Indians on the Isthmus of Darien, Bocca del Toto, and l'isle d'Or, who kill without mercy and eat all who fall into their hands. This may be true and it may not be true, for the Indians in those places are a long way off, and have different customs and speak a different language.

I also know, and it is quite true, that when the English and French first settled in the Islands many men of both nations were killed, *boucanned*, and eaten by the Caribs. But this was due to the inability of the Indians to take revenge on the Europeans for their injustice and cruelty, and it was impotent rage, and not custom, that urged them to commit this excess after being hunted from their islands, and done to death with unheard-of tortures. Again, if they were cannibals in those days, why are they not cannibals now? I have certainly never heard of them eating people, whether English-men with whom the Carib are nearly always fighting, or Allouages Indians of the mainland near the Orinoco with whom they are continually at war.

It is true too that when they kill a man, they often *boucan* his limbs and fill calabashes with his fat to take home with them. They do this, however, to keep as trophies and proofs of their victory and courage. The Indians of Canada have a similar custom and keep the scalps of enemies whom they have killed in battle, or tortured to death in a horrible manner. Our savages are less cruel. When they capture women, no matter what race they may be, they always treat them kindly, and if they marry them regard them as belonging to their nation. When they capture children they bring them up as if they were their own, and the worst thing that can happen to them is to be sold as slaves to Europeans. With regard to men, it is certain that they kill them in the heat of battle, and do not take the trouble of making them prisoners . . .

I repeat that though the Caribs do *boucan* the limbs of enemies they have slain, it is only done to preserve the memory of the fight and rouse them to future vengeance, and not with any idea of eating them . . .

At these feasts when all the guests have eaten to repletion and drunk ouicou

and taffia to excess, the master of the carbet explains his proposals. Whatever these may be the Indians invariably show their approval in the customary manner. If it be to arrange a war party, an old woman enters the carbet and harangues the guests to excite them to vengeance. She recounts the wrongs that they have suffered at the hands of their enemies, and recites a long list of their friends and relations who have been killed. When she sees that they are properly heated by drink and showing signs of fury, she throws the *boucanned* limbs of some enemy into their midst. The Indians thereupon fall on the limbs, cutting, tearing, biting and gnawing them, with all the rage cowardly and vindictive drunkards are capable of showing ... (Labat in Eaden 1970: 99-103).

Labat is convinced that the Caribs never practiced customary cannibalism, that they did eat English and French when they first settled the islands. but only out of the deepest frustrations at being hunted nearly to extinction, and that they kill and boucan, but do not eat, their male Indian captives. The worst thing they do is sell captured Arawak children to Europeans as slaves. The story of Island Carib cannibalism has come nearly full circle from the accounts of Carib predations served up by the first Spanish explorers.

As with earlier reports, it is never clear whether Labat is reporting observed facts or stories the Caribs told him. He does not report seeing a boucanned limb himself. He knows "and it is quite true" that English and French (but not the Spanish?) were eaten when they "first settled in the islands" but this yields a date only back to the 1620s, a time which has been described by most others as long after they ceased eating Europeans. Therefore, his time frame for when alleged cannibalism stopped should be pushed back. Labat does not say whether he used an interpreter, or which was the language of communication. It is clear that Labat knows the other published works on the Antilles, and with his historian's ear and extended time in the region, he knows the local lore and oral traditions.

Neveu-Lemaire, unpersuaded by Labat's denial, writes that "meat is an unimportant part of their diet ..." but that

even formerly when they did not object to human flesh it seems that they used it only rarely; when following a war they had massacred a large number of enemies, they thought it only fitting to eat them. Furthermore, Father Labat is full of indulgence towards them on this point, and although they had once

offered him the smoked arm of an Englishman, probably the remains of a feast, he finds it hard to apply to them the epithet of cannibals (Neveu-Lemaire 1921; trans. in HRAF St 13, 10: 9).

He is drawing on traditions that predated Labat for more than a century.

Labat's judgments of the Island Caribs run to extremes. He calls them the laziest people under the sun. "They will spend days together only getting in and out of their hammocks, and are surely the most careless and lazy creatures that have ever come from the hands of God" (Eaden 1970: 73). They are also the fiercest and most independent, "jealous of their liberty," and consider the Europeans cowards (Eaden 1970: 104). The context of Labat's visit was that of a foreigner bringing a valued gift, for everywhere he made friends and loosened tongues with the demon libation. "... [we] were well received in all the carbets that we visited. How could it be otherwise? We had rum" (Eaden 1970: 96). When these data of Labat, as well as the other Europeans, are interpreted in light of the cautions of Dean and Whyte (1958) and Vansina (1965), their literal value is diminished substantially.

OTHER SOURCES

Linguistics. Columbus's problems communicating with the Amerindians have been mentioned. His Arabic-speaking interpreter was useless; sign language and a rudimentary lingua franca may have led to significant errors. Some Indians learned Spanish and later French or French Creole, but only Breton, 150 years after original contact and after decimation by diseases, warring, and slaving Spaniards, concerned himself with Carib of Arawak. Unfortunately, he offers no unique vocabulary for cannibal cuisine and no commentary on the preparation or taste of human flesh. One would expect a ritual evoking such deep emotions among the Caribs and their captives to have acquired a specialized vocabulary or more elaborate linguistic context.

Historical Cartography. Descriptive place names and illustrations on maps can be revealing. The Spanish and Portuguese, and later the

French, designated New World islands and regions as cannibal domains. Juan de la Cosa labels Dominica or the islands in that area as *illa de cannibales* on the first map of the world showing the New World explorations (1500). Johannes Ruysch in Ptolomy's *Geographia* (1508), shifts the label *canibalos* southward to Trinidad (Kohl 1860).

Anonymous maps drawn between 1502 and 1503, but not published until 1859 by Kunstmann, show the early influence of Amerigo Vespucci.

Unquestionably the cartographer took his information from Amerigo's voyage . . . The illustrations of the map are as interesting as the coastline. The interior of Brazil shows a meticulously drawn scene of a spit being slowly turned by a kneeling Indian, and on the spit a naked white man being roasted over the flames. This drawing was to be repeated on subsequent maps (Arciniegas 1955: 213-214).

The 1516 world map of Martin Waldseemüller, a new edition of the 1507 map which first used America (Amerige) for the New World, designates an island close to South America as *Cambales*, clearly labels the Guianas as "terra canibalorx qui hant habität antropophagi," and includes a vivid etching of a cannibal victim (1907).

Waldseemüller, whose maps are a riot of color and of fact and fancy, limits to three lines his description of Brasil on his phanisphere of 1516. He says first that its lands are inhabited by anthropophagi and adds "Brasilia sive terra Papagalli" (Arciniegas 1955: 182).

That is, Brazil has cannibals and parrots.

The 1527 world map of Vesconte de Maggiolo labels the Lesser Antilles clearly but omits cannibals entirely. Simon Grynaeus's 1532 world map locates *canibali* in northeastern South America, not in the islands (1532).

Spanish and Portuguese mapmakers pushed the designation "cannibal" to remote regions of the southern continent. Similarly, the Amazons, once thought to reside on "Martinino," were re-located in central South America with a major river as namesake. The French and English, about a century behind the Spanish in exploration, persisted longer in using the terms "cannibal isles" or "home of the anthropophagi." Yet cartographic depictions neither confirm nor disprove the existence of cannibalism, but

rather suggest the extent to which the idea was embedded in the minds of the mapmaker and his public².

Archaeology. The issue of cannibalism could be more easily resolved if there were physical evidence, such as appropriately broken skulls or long bones, or tooth- or knife-marked bones, but none exist. To make matters worse, Carib sites are not easily distinguished from Arawak sites. According to Irving Rouse, perhaps the most knowledgeable archaeologist of the Caribbean,

So far as I am aware, there is no clear evidence of cannibalism in the West Indies. Scattered human bones have been found in a number of sites, but we do not know whether they are the result of cannibalism or of the practice of keeping the bones of ancestors as religious objects. One problem is that we have not yet been able satisfactorily to identify a Carib site. As Louis Allaire demonstrates in his doctoral dissertation at Yale, all the sites found to date are probably pre-Carib (personal communication, July 13, 1979).

Wooden structures for boucanning victims as depicted by De Bry, would not survive; and large cooking pots are few. The tropical climate, acidic soils, and locations of modern towns over Amerindian sites may have destroyed important artifacts. But archaeological exploration of the Lesser Antilles is incomplete and evidence may exist which has not been discovered.

DISCUSSION

As time distanced reputed events from the people who described them, three broad uses of these primary data emerged. Several writers and anthropologists either ignored the cannibalism issue or, examining it critically, asserted its weak factual basis and exploitative nature. This group, including Ober, Windsor, Moore, Knight, Arens, and above all, Taylor, pointed out the limitations of the existing accounts and the cultural biases of the explorers and priests.

A second approach has been to take the alleged facts at face value and pass them on to unsuspecting readers. Professional writers, historians, and anthropologists have assumed all too often that any events recounted by an informant or historical document

were accurate reports of behavior (Davies 1981; Farb and Armelagos 1980; Morison 1942, 1971, 1974; Rouse 1948).

Another misuse of the alleged facts appears in three crosscultural surveys of the practice. E. M. Loeb links circumcision, finger sacrifice, and cannibalism in a "blood sacrifice complex" (1923). He barely mentions the Caribs, citing as his source "Cronau, Rud. Amerika. (Leipzig, 1892) Bd. 1, pp. 252, 272" (1923: 35), a curious reference given available primary sources. Ewald Volhard's *Kannibalismus* (1939) is the most thorough study of cannibalism attempted, yet he devotes one page out of nearly 500 to the West Indies. He describes general features of cannibalism and refers to the study of T. A. Joyce (1916), who, unfortunately, has little to say about Island Carib cannibalism. Other names he mentions — de Poincy, Peter Martyr, Ferdinand Kolumbus — are not listed in the extensive bibliography. Reay Tannahill's popular study *Flesh and Blood, a History of the Cannibal Complex* (1975), refers to the Caribs twice:

... and it was, in fact, the resultant craving for meat that turned such peoples as the Caribs and the Papuans into the great cannibals of the postmediaeval world (1975: 17).

It is virtually impossible to discover the unvarnished truth about the early Caribs because layers of legend were so quickly built up around them ... (1975: 75).

There is no evidence for the first statement, and the second is the point of this essay.

A third group exaggerates the earliest, extreme Spanish material. Samuel Eliot Morison was particularly guilty:

In huts deserted by the natives they found human limbs and cuts of human flesh partly consumed, as well as emasculated boys who were being fattened to provide the main dish for a feast, and girl captives used to produce babies for the hors d'oeuvre. Two boys and 'twelve very beautiful plump girls from fifteen to sixteen years old' were picked up by the Spaniards. These girls, who had been captured by the Caribs in a raid on Hispaniola, were useful as interpreters, and doubtless in other ways too (Morison 1974: 106).

Morison spins a good yarn, but he has subtle ways of demeaning the "natives dressed in warpaint" and the practices which make humans into objects or courses on a menu. He gets a lot of mileage

from the historical material. Consider the same event described by him thirty-two years earlier:

In huts deserted by the warriors, who ungallantly fled, they found large cuts and joints of human flesh, skin bones set aside to make arrows of, caponized Arawak boy captives who were being fattened for the friddle, and girl captives who were mainly used to produce babies, which the Caribs regarded as a particularly toothsome morsel (1942, II: 70).

Charlesworth Ross embellishes the material with poetic flair:

Their anthropophagy was of a ceremonial rather than of a gastronomical nature. They ate a brave enemy to possess themselves of his warlike qualities and to seal a military victory beyond all doubt . . .

Carib victims were got ready for eating while still alive. The Caribs cut slits down the back and sides of their enemies and stuffed the body with spices. They then killed the victim with a mace, and the corpses were trussed to poles and roasted over a fire, while the women turned and basted the bodies, catching the lard which dripped into gourds and calabashes for future use. Some of the meat was eaten on the spot; some was stored away for lean periods in the future (1970: 52-53).

Ernlé Bradford follows in similar unattributed fashion:

. . . the Caribs would raid the other islands and carry off the young women and boys. The latter were castrated and fattened for the pot like capons. The girls were used like battery hens to produce the piece de resistance on the Carib menu — roast baby. (Their children by their own women were, of course, treated quite differently). The Caribs seem to have regarded the other peoples inhabiting the islands as no more than human fodder. The fact was that they had no domestic animals for consumption, and cannibalism had possibly been forced upon them by this lack in their diet (Bradford 1973: 184).

What explains the perpetuation of gruesome details of Carib cannibalism, and the continued matter-of-fact linkage of the Island Carib with anthropophagy even after it was downplayed by the only Europeans who knew them well? Exploitative Spanish interests were well served by portrayal of the Indians as sub-human savages. Las Casas spoke up for the Indian (MacNutt 1909; Poole 1974, Sanderlin 1971), but his was virtually a lone voice until the mid-seventeenth century. Long before then the theme of cannibalism found fertile soil in European consciousness.

Deliberate public relations manipulations by the Spanish are not sufficient to explain the firm foothold the idea of cannibalism

rapidly acquired. Xenophobia played a role. Europeans had never encountered on a large scale anything like the Amerindians, whether pacific Arawaks or their stereotypical counterpoint, the Caribs. The collision of cultures was sharp and required intellectual adjustments by both groups. It took Europeans years to decide whether the Amerindians were human enough to have souls. It was a simple feat to relegate the shockingly new Amerindians to a category of creatures who ate their own kind. Once cannibalism was rumoured or attributed, it was difficult to disprove.

Explorers' experiences never confirmed bald, tailed or dog-faced men, cyclopes, or islands of women; for want of even circumstantial evidence, they vanished from the record. Cannibalism was another matter. Customary cannibalism remained just plausible enough to seem real. It was easily "confirmed" by circumstantial evidence. Once conferred, popular labels are rarely forgotten.

The idea of cannibalism fascinates: it reliably excites a strong emotional response. It offers power through complete domination of enemies or reverence for loved ones. It is the ultimate negation or incorporation of another person by the most elemental act: ingestion. Cannibalism evokes polar, not ambiguous, categories. It does not so much separate humans from animals, as good humans from evil ones. Those labeled cannibals are still recognized as human. They are, however, seen as abnormal, bad, immoral, insane, or damned, depending on circumstances or accuser, and treated accordingly. The Island Caribs were labeled uncivilized, and therefore were exploitable; deviant and therefore feared; evil therefore fair game. Cannibals are part of that diverse company of abnormals which has included witches, communists, and homosexuals: scapegoats whose existence serves prevailing conventions, sometimes for generations.

CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions about Island Carib cannibalism are justified.

1. Columbus believed in Carib cannibalism long before he saw

circumstantial evidence. Neither he nor any of his sailors witnessed the act. His accounts, like most, if not all, of those who followed him are flawed by serious cultural biases.

2. Belief in the existence of cannibalism was an integral part of the hostilities between Arawaks and Caribs, and between Caribs and Europeans. The idea of the practice, whether justified or not, served positive functions for each group. For Arawaks and Europeans, it was important in characterizing the violent enemy and it was used to justify slavery, reprisal, and extinction. For the Caribs it supported their self-view as fierce warriors, and was used to mobilize their aggressions; after European contact, it aided their survival by keeping European settlers at bay.

3. If cannibalism was practiced at the end of the fifteenth century, it rapidly disappeared.

4. The ethnographic record is remarkably sparse given cannibalism's prominence in the region's lore. Descriptions of cannibalism lack the detail found for other aspects of Carib life. If the act had larger ritual, mythological, or symbolic components, they have been lost.

5. French priests living among the Caribs downplayed or rejected the cannibalism label, stressing other features of Island Carib character.

6. There is as much detail or more about individuals well treated or adopted by Caribs as about the supposed cruelties and cannibalistic feasts.

7. Early chroniclers did not explore alternative interpretations of the circumstantial evidence for cannibalism. Bones might have been kept for religious reasons, or boiled and cleaned for use as tools, household items, or musical instruments.

8. Few observers distinguished between oral traditions and witnessed events. Most informants had something to gain by claiming the Caribs were cannibals.

9. Neither archaeological nor linguistic data support the existence of cannibalism.

10. Some recent writers and historians exaggerated or distorted reports of Island Carib cannibalism without regard for primary sources.

In view of these conclusions, there is a reasonable doubt that the

customary cannibalism attributed to the Island Caribs existed. Available data do not allow an absolute conclusion, but all the evidence is weak, circumstantial, and largely secondhand. If the Caribs were on trial for cannibalism, they would be acquitted.

Unfortunately, justice is not blind; nor are explorers, historians, anthropologists, or journalists unbiased. The view of Island Caribs as cannibals will remain, at least in the popular press, as illustrated by a recent *Wall Street Journal* article on Dominica:

After Columbus's sighting, only sailors ventured ashore but were promptly murdered, and often eaten, by the Caribs, an inhospitable band of Indians (Goolrick 1982: 22).

NOTES

1. This is a revised version of a paper presented at the 1981 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association. Thanks to Salvador Baldizon, Paolo Piergentili, and Charles Beaudry for their help in translating Spanish, Italian, and French sources, and to Jerome Handler, Sidney Mintz, and Richard Price for their suggestions and encouragement.

2. The tendency of cartographers to fill voids with imaginative illustrations has been noted by others, especially in the case of Africa. "If there was any part of the world where the map was a blank inviting embellishment, it was Africa south of the Sahara, the part of the world of which Swift wrote:

So geographers, in Afric maps,
With savage pictures fill their gaps,
And o'er inhabitable downs
Place elephants for want of towns."
(Lloyd 1972: 21)

Graham Greene encountered the problem in 1935, for his trip across Liberia when he acquired two large-scale maps, one British, one American.

Where the English map is content to leave a blank space, the American in large letters fills it with the word 'Cannibals' . . . there is something Elizabethan in its imagination. 'Dense Forest'; 'Cannibals'; rivers which don't exist, at any rate anywhere near where they are put; one expects to find Eldorado, two-headed men and fabulous beasts represented in little pictures in the Gola Forrest.
(Greene 1978: 45-46)

REFERENCES

- ALLAIRE, LOUIS, 1976. On the historicity of Carib migrations in the Lesser Antilles. *American Antiquity* 45(2): 238-245, April.
- ANDREWS, KENNETH R. (ed.), 1959 *English privateering voyages to the West Indies, 1588-1595*. Hakluyt Society, Second series, no. 111. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- 1972. *The last voyage of Drake and Hawkins*. The Hakluyt Society, Second series, no. 142. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- ARBER, EDWARD, 1971. *The first three English books on America, 1511-1555 A.D.* New York, Kraus Reprint Co. (orig. 1885).
- ARCINIEGAS, GERMÁN, 1955. *Amerigo and the New World. The life and times of Amerigo Vespucci*. Harriet de Onis, trans. New York, Alfred A. Knopf.
- ARENS, WILLIAM, 1979. *The Man-Eating Myth*. New York, Oxford.
- BARBOUR, PHILIP L. (ed.), 1969. *The Jamestown voyages under the First Charter 1606-1609*, 2 vols. The Hakluyt Society, second series, nos. 136, 137. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- BOROMÉ, JOSEPH, 1966. Spain and Dominica. *Caribbean Quarterly* 12(4): 30-46.
- BOUTON, JAKUES, 1958. Concerning the savages called Caribs (from: *Relation de l'establisement des Francois depuis l'an 1635 en l'isle de Martinique ...*). Marshall McKusick and Pierre Verin, trans. HRAF 1958 ST 13 Callinago 3; also in Rennard 1935: 36-82.
- BRADFORD, ERNLE, 1973. *Christopher Columbus*. London, Michael Joseph.
- BRADY, IVAN, 1982. The Myth-Eating Man. *American Anthropologist* 84(3): 595-611.
- BRETON, RAYMOND, 1665. Father Raymond Breton's observations of the Islands Carib. A compilation of ethnographic notes taken from Breton's Carib-French dictionary published in 1665. M. McKusick and P. Verin, trans. and abridged. HRAF ST 13 Callinago 2.
- BROWN, PAULA and DONALD TUZIN (eds.), 1983. The Ethnography of Cannibalism. *Society for Psychological Anthropology*. Special Publication No. 1, Washington, D.C.
- BURRAGE, HENRY S. (ed.), 1906. *Early English and French voyages chiefly from Hakluyt 1534-1608*. New York, Barnes and Noble.
- BURTON, ROBERT, 1698. *The English Empire in America: on a prospect of His Majesty's dominions in the West Indies*. London, 3rd edition.

CHANCA, DIEGO ALVAREZ [1494], see Ybarra 1907. Also in Martin Fernandes de Navarrete Colección . . . , Vol. 15: 200-224.

DAVIES, NIGEL, 1981. *Human sacrifice: in history and today*. New York, William Morrow and Co.

DE BRY, THEODORE, 1590-95. *Wunderbarliche, doch warhaftige erklärung . . . America*. Frankfurt am Main, J. Wechel.

DEAN, JOHN P. and WILLIAM FOOTE WHYTE, 1958. How do you know if the informant is telling the truth? *Human Organization* 17(2): 34-38.

DE LA PAIX, ARMAND and RAYMOND BRETON, MS. Relation de l'isle de la Guadeloupe faite par les missionnaires dominicains à leur général en 1647. In Rennard 1929: 23-127.

DUTERTRE, JEAN-BAPTISTE, 1667. Concerning the natives of the Antilles. From *Histoire générale des isles de S. Christophe, de la Guadeloupe, de la martinique et autre dan l'Amérique*. Trans. by M. McKusick and P. Verin. HRAF. ST 13 Callinago 4: 1-42.

EADEN, JOHN (trans. and ed.), 1970. *The mémoire of Père Labat 1693-1705*. London, Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.

ESCARDO, MAURICIO E., 1978. Who were the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands at the time of Columbus' arrival? *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress for the Study of Pre-Columbian Cultures of the Lesser Antilles*. Montreal, Centre de recherches caraïbes, pp. 245-257.

FARB, PETER and GEORGE ARMELAGOS, 1980. *Consuming passions. The Anthropology of Eating*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.

FIGUEREDO, ALFREDO E., 1978. The Virgin Islands as a historical frontier between the Tainos and the Caribs. *Revista/Review Inter-Americana* 8(3): 393-399.

GREENE, GRAHAM, 1978 [1936]. *Journey Without Maps*. Penguin Books, Ltd.

GOOLRICK, CHESTER, 1982. Tiny Dominica Is Land of Hurricanes, Poverty and Political Turmoil. *Wall Street Journal*, June 8, pp. 1, 22.

Great Britain. Public Record Office, 1896. *Calendar of State Papers. Colonial Series. America and the West Indies*. Vol. 10, 1677-1680; vol. 11, 1683. London: HMSO.

GRYANEUS, SIMON, 1532. *Map of the New World*. British Museum.

HENRIQUEZ UREÑA, PEDRO, 1938. *Para la historia de los indigenismos*. Buenos Aires.

HODGE, W. H. and DOUGLAS M. TAYLOR, 1957. The ethnobotany of the Island Caribs of Dominica. *Webbia* 12(2): 513-644.

IRVING, Washington, 1831. *Voyages and discoveries of the companions of Columbus*. Philadelphia, Carey and Lea.

JANE, LIONEL CECIL (ed. and trans.), 1930. *The voyages of Christopher Columbus, being the journals of his first and third, and the letters concerning his first and last voyages, to which is added the account of his second voyage written by Andrés Bernáldez*. London, Argonaut Press.

JESSE, REV. C., 1963. The Spanish cedula of December 23, 1511, on the subject of the Caribs. *Caribbean Quarterly* 9(3): 22-32.

JOYCE, T. A., 1916. *Central American and West Indian Archaeology*. London, Philip Lee Warner.

KOHL, J. G., 1860. *Die beiden ältesten General-Karten von Amerika*. Weimar, Geographisches Institute.

LABAT, R. P. JEAN-BAPTISTE, 1724. *Nouveau voyage aux isles de l'Amérique*. La Haye, P. Hussion, T. Johnson, et al. 6 vols.

LA BORDE, R. P. de, 1674. *Voyage qui contient une relation exacte de l'origine, moeurs, coutumes, religion, guerres et voyages des Caraïbes, sauvages des isles Antilles de l'Amérique*. A Liège, Chez P. van de Aa.

LA COSA, JUAN de, [1500]. *Map of the World*. Facsimile on parchment, 1892, British Museum.

LLOYD, CHRISTOPHER, 1972. *The Search for the Niger*. London, Collins.

LOEB, E. M., 1923. The blood sacrifice complex. *American Anthropological Association Memoir* No. 30. Kraus Reprint, 1964.

MACNUTT, FRANCIS AUGUSTUS, 1909. *Bartholomew De las Casas. His life, his apostolate, and his writings*. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

— 1912. *De orbe novo. The eight decades of Peter Martyr D'Anghera*. 2 vols. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

MAJOR, R. H. (trans. and ed.), 1847. *Select letters of Christopher Columbus, with other original documents, relating to his four voyages to the New World*. London, The Hakluyt Society.

MOORE, RICHARD B., 1972. *Caribs, 'cannibals,' and human relations. A revealing exposure of smears and stereotypes*. Patchogue, New York, Pathway Publishers.

— 1973. Carib 'cannibalism': a study in anthropological stereotyping. *Caribbean Studies* 13(3): 117-135.

MORISON, SAMUEL ELIOT, 1939. *The second voyage of Christopher Columbus from Cadiz to Hispaniola and the discovery of the Lesser Antilles*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

— 1942. *Admiral of the Ocean Sea. A life of Christopher Columbus*. Boston, Little, Brown and Co. One volume edition and a two volume with more extensive notes.

— 1963. *Journals and other documents on the life and voyages of Christopher Columbus*, trans. and ed. by S. E. Morison. New York, Heritage Press.

— 1971. *The European discovery of America. The Northern voyages A.D. 500–1600*. New York, Oxford University Press.

— 1974. *The European discovery of America. The Southern voyages A.D. 1492–1616*. New York, Oxford University Press.

MURPHY, HENRY C., 1875. *The voyages of Verrazzano: a chapter in the early history of maritime discovery in America*. New York.

MYERS, ROBERT A., 1978. Ethnohistorical vs. ecological considerations: the case of Dominica's Amerindians. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress for the Study of Pre-Columbian Cultures of the Lesser Antilles*. Montreal, Centre de recherches caraïbes, pp. 325–41.

MYERS, ROBERT A., 1981. Amerindians of the Lesser Antilles: a bibliography. New Haven, Human Relations Area Files Press.

NEVEU-LEMAIRE, M., 1921. Les Caraïbes des Antilles. *Géographie* 35(2): 127–146. Trans. in HRAF St 13 Callinago, 1959.

OBER, FREDERICK A., 1895. Aborigines of the West Indies. *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* n.s. 9: 270–313, April, 1894, HRAF ST 13 Callinago 9.

PETITJEAN-ROGET, JACQUES, 1963. The Caribs as seen through the dictionary of the Reverend Father Breton. *Proceedings of the First International Convention for the Study of Pre-Columbian Culture in the Lesser Antilles*. Part. I. Fort-de-France. pp. 43–68.

POOLE, STAFFORD (trans.), 1974. *In defense of the Indies. The defense of the most reverend Lord, Don Fray Bartolomé Las Casas . . . against the persecutions and slanderers of the peoples of the New World discovered across the seas*. DeKalb, Northern Illinois University Press.

PURCHAS, SAMUEL, 1625. *Purchas his Pilgrimes*. In five books. The fourth part. Vol. 4. London, William Stansby for Henrie Fetherstone.

RENNARD, JOSEPH (ed.), 1929 *Les Caraïbes, la Guadeloupe, 1635–1656: histoire des vingt premières années de la colonisation de la Guadeloupe d'après les relations du R. P. Breton*. Paris, Librairie G. Ficker.

— 1935. *Tricentenaire des Antilles, Guadeloupe-Martinique: documents*. Fort-de-France and Paris.

ROCHFORD, CHARLES de, 1658. *Histoire naturelle et morale des îles Antilles de l'Amerique*. Rotterdam, A. Leers.

ROSS, CHARLESWORTH, 1970. Caribs and Arawaks. *Caribbean Quarterly* 16(3): 52-59.

ROUSE, IRVING, 1948. The Carib In J. Steward, (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians*. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 143, pp. 547-565. HRAF ST 13 Callinago 5.

— 1979. Personal communication. July 13.

SAGAN, ELI, 1974. *Cannibalism: Human Aggression and Cultural Form*. New York, Harper Torch Books.

SALAMANCA, DIEGO de, 1587. Memoir corca de la isla Dominica. British Museum Add. MS. 36314. (copy)

SALAS, JULIO C., 1921. *Los indios caribes. Estudio sobre el origen del mito de la antropofagia*. Barcelona.

SANDERLIN, GEORGE (trans. and ed.), 1971. *Bartolomé de las Casas. A selection of his writings*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf.

SHELDON, WILLIAM, 1820. A brief account of the Caraihs who inhabited the Antilles. *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* 1: 365-433.

SOUTHEY, THOMAS, 1827. *A chronological history of the West Indies*. 3 vols. London, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Greene.

TAYLOR, DOUGLAS MACRAE, 1935. The island Caribs of Dominica, B.W.I. *American Anthropologist* 37: 265-272.

— 1936. Additional notes on the Island Carib of Dominica B.W.I. *American Anthropologist* 38: 462-268.

— 1938. The Caribs of Dominica. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 119. *Anthropological Papers*, No. 3. Smithsonian Institution, pp. 109-159. Washington, D.C.

— 1945. Carib folk-beliefs and customs from Dominica. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1: 507-530.

— 1946. Kinship and social structure of the Island Carib. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 2: 180-212.

— 1949. The interpretations of some documentary evidence on Carib culture. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 5: 379-392.

— 1950. The meaning of dietary and occupational restrictions among the Island Carib. *American Anthropologist* 52: 343-349. HRAF ST 13 Callinago 8.

— 1951. *The Black Carib of British Honduras*. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology No. 17. New York, Wenner-Gren.

— 1952. Tales and legends of the Dominica Caribs. *Journal of American Folk-lore* 65: 267-279.

— 1958. Carib, caliban, cannibal. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 24: 156-157.

TAYLOR, DOUGLAS and B. J. HOFF, 1980. The linguistic repertory of the Island Carib in the seventeenth century: the men's language — a Carib pidgin? *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46(4): 301-312.

VANSINA, JAN, 1965. *Oral Traditions*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

VOLHARD, EWLAD, 1939. *Kannibalismus*. Stuttgart, Strecker and Schroder. Johnson Reprint Corp. New York. 1968.

WALDSEEMÜLLER, MARTIN (or HYLACOMYLUS), 1907. *Die Cosmographiae Introductio des Martin Waldseemüller in Faksimiledruck*. Einleitung von Fr. R. von Wieser.

WINSOR, JUSTIN (ed.), 1889. *Narrative and critical history of America*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin and Co.

WROTH, LAWRENCE C., 1970. *The voyages of Giovanni da Verrazzano 1524-1528*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

YBARRA, A. M. FERNANDEZ de, 1907. The letter of Dr. Diego Alvares Chanca, dated 1494, relating to the second voyage of Columbus to America, *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections* 48: 428-457. Washington, The Smithsonian Institution.

ROBERT A. MYERS

Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology

Davidson College

Davidson, North Carolina 28036, U.S.A.

REVIEW ARTICLES

MORE ON THE PECULIAR INSTITUTION¹

Testing the chains: resistance to slavery in the British West Indies.
MICHAEL CRATON. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press,
1982. 389 pp. (Cloth US\$ 29.50)

Slavery and social death: a comparative study. ORLANDO PATTERSON.
Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1982.
xv + 511 pp. (Cloth US\$ 30.00)

To say born and raised in Cuba is, to mean I was born and raised among slaves. My parents owned some, though only a few, and I inherited them. Hence I am speaking of something here that I know about not only from the books I have read but also from my personal experience.

To write this work I have pursued the most remote antecedents of some peoples; I have looked at sculptures and inscriptions that still endure on the walls of the most ancient of the world's monuments; I've searched the annals of more than fifty centuries; in all of them, in the Old World as in the New, I have always found humans enslaved by others. Barbarous nations and civilized ones, large and small, powerful and weak, peaceful and warlike, under the most varied forms of government, professing the most different sorts of religion and without regard to climate or epoch, all have carried in their breasts the poison that is slavery. Did there ever exist a people where slavery did not appear under one of the forms I identified? Could there be somewhere in the record of humanity a period, however short, in which slavery had disappeared from the globe?

José Antonio Saco, *Historia de la esclavitud* (1936 [1883] I: 5-6)

Since José Antonio Saco wrote those words, the study of the peculiar institution has gone through many phases, while slavery

itself, at least in the form with which Saco was familiar, has disappeared. Modern scholarship on slavery can aspire to a quality and thoroughness previously unattainable, since the accumulation of new knowledge, particularly in the last quarter of a century, has been without precedent. Here are two new works of different character and scale, by two of the most prolific writers on slavery of their generation. Though these are books with divergent intentions, they share one general feature: both authors are lumpers instead of splitters. Craton recounts many individual instances of slaves revolting in a search for the catalyst of active resistance; Patterson wants to explain to us what slavery is, and examines scores of cases to isolate its germ. Both authors seek to wash into view the nugget in the sand. Such laudable ambitions, of course, are not without risks.

Craton aims to disentangle the history of the reactions of slaves in the British West Indies to their condition from the onset of slavery in those colonies until the last revolts before Emancipation. The book is divided into five parts: (I) the plantation world and slave resistance short of rebellion; (II) maroon resistance, 1600–1775; (III) African slaves; (IV) slave resistance in the Age of Revolution, 1775–1885; and (V) slave rebellions and Emancipation, 1816–1832. Each part is divided into chapters; each initial chapter considers in general terms the themes to follow. In Parts II–V, these consist mainly of particular descriptions, such as Cudjoe's War (Part II, Chapter 7), or Bussa's Rebellion (Part V, Chapter 20). Though Craton makes clear that the book is selective, he attributes this not so much to acknowledged gaps in research and data, as to his desire to deal with representative cases.

The analytical position Craton assumes, however, is curious. The book is dedicated to the martyred Guyanese historian, Walter Rodney, and begins with citations from C. L. R. James, the author of *The Black Jacobins*, and Herbert Aptheker, the author of *American Negro Slave Revolts*. But Craton rejects "the pioneer populists' pure Marxism" (p. 11), proclaiming that he does not suffer from "Marxist optimism" (p. 17). Thereafter the references to Marxism, though quite numerous, seem designed to keep the reader interested in what the author thinks about that

point of view — as if this were not really deducible from the interpretations. On page 334, one trying to make sense of the book's final sentence would still be wondering — if, indeed, the subject were any longer of interest. This somewhat sophomoric Marx-gets-Craton, Marx-loses-Craton scenario could have been safely omitted in its entirety. Unfortunately, it is linked to Craton's position on the relevant issues.

Seeking to catalogue slave resistance, the author set up a tripartite sequential division: 1) "maroon-type" revolts; 2) revolts led by unassimilated Africans; and 3) late slave rebellions led by "creole (colony born) members of the slave elite" (p. 13). At the outset, Craton tells us, he surmised that resistance "might flare into revolt" under four conditions: where there was extreme repression; where unassimilable elements were found in the subject population; where the forces of control were weakened; or where slave expectations became frustrated. The author believes these divisions continued to serve his purposes during his research, their principal advantage inhering in the stress they put upon endogenous forces. (Craton resists strongly the idea that external political events may have deeply affected the will or readiness of the slaves to resist; but he does not satisfactorily explain — at least to this reader — why this would have been the case, or why he feels so strongly about it.)

Classifications of this kind must be used cautiously, lest a "superhistorical" position result in insufficient concern with the historical particulars in each case. If Craton is aware of the difficulty, he does not allow it to get in the way of his imagination. Nor, for that matter, is he much discouraged by factual lacunae. Two examples may suffice. The first has to do with the general subject of language. There is a good deal of talk about language and languages in this book, and most of it is ill-informed or evasive. On page 47, the cultural importance of the African past is weighed, and Douglas Taylor, the late Caribbean linguist, is invoked by Craton, in support of the following observation:

But because folklore and proverbs identical with African originals, along with songs, dances, games, recipes, and some 10 percent of African words in the different creole languages, are still current in the British West Indies 140 years after the end of slavery (quite apart from the legacies in black religion), the

African influences in the slave quarters must have been extremely strong, even after the African-born became a minority.

Craton's reference, however, is to the first half of Taylor's book, that concerned with indigenous Caribbean languages; while the second half, on creole languages, contains nothing I could find that was related in any way to Craton's assertions about the strength of the African past.² Craton goes on:

Plantation owners deliberately avoided placing large groups of the same ethnicity on a plantation, and nothing melds and submerges minority languages more quickly than the need to communicate. Yet African languages were sustained by the will to retain a private mode of communication and must have continued in use as long as two people who spoke the same tongue were close enough to each other to keep in practice. The existence of a special language different from that of the master class itself was a tradition in parts of Africa; such a language was even found among the descendants of Arawaks subjugated by the Caribs (handed down by the women). To the consternation of the whites, the mainly illiterate slaves long retained the African art of communicating by drums, sending complex secret messages very rapidly over long distances [p. 47].

One would be hard put to come up with a paragraph on the subject of language misleading in more regards than this; but the citation which precedes it, on African influences, comes close. If the author has read seriously on the nature of Afro-American cultural or linguistic change or retention, he has managed successfully to repress all of his insights while crafting these passages.

The problem persists in nearly every discussion of language in the book. In explaining the thwarted 1683 revolt in Barbados, for instance, Craton writes: "... the fact that the slaves communicated in English, rather than indicating a degree of acculturation, is evidence that the African ethnicities needed a lingua franca" (p. 110). Though he tries to explain further what he means, this assertion is confusing at best. Again, to handle the claim that the "Coromantees" among the Jamaican maroons spoke some putatively African language, Craton hypothesizes that "this particular tongue may have been a syncretic form, purposely developed and handed down by the captains and obeahmen who led the band" (p. 78). The author is fond of the word "syncretic," but it is not clear what he means by it, other than "mixed" or

"blended." Thus uncertainty is displayed anew in the odd way that the languages of Afro-Americans are dealt with generally here: "... in the creation of creole languages, English was the basic instrument but with an enriched vocabulary, a subtly changed inner structure, and an intonation so 'African' that if the resident whites could understand it, Europeans could not" (p. 48). In fact, the "basic instrument" was not so basic and changes of the "inner structure" were not so subtle; Craton is detained by these matters because he does not know whether the language in question was really English; but he also does not know how to ask that very question. Not surprisingly, terminological and definitional difficulties pursue him. Thus, for instance, a "patois" on page 147 becomes a "French patois" on page 185, changes into a "French creole" on page 201, and finally becomes a "creole patois" on page 235.

A second example of the insouciant use of concepts unfamiliar to the author comes with the specification of human social groups. On page 21, we learn of "tribes," on page 22 of "the Carib nation," on pages 26 and 78 of a "warrior caste," on page 165 of "warlike traditional cultures," on pages 110, 175, and 223 of "ethnicities," and on page 178 of "Ashanti-like warrior polities"; finally, on page 207, we learn that the Black Carib "are today the nearest approximation to a truly Afro-American *nation* in the Caribbean region." Words such as "caste" and "nation" really do have meanings, though; and while "ethnicity" certainly can be used to stand for some kind of group (*ethnos*), it seems to turn up here whenever the author knows too little about some group to be able to label it. Surely he should have studied more carefully Barbara Kopytoff's analysis, which he praises warmly (p. 62).

Another rather curious difficulty with this book, having to do with the use of sources, will distract the specialist reader more than the reader in search of broad enlightenment. Craton is widely read in historical and social-scientific literature on the Caribbean, and particularly the anglophone West Indies. Each chapter in this book is amply footnoted, and authorities are cited. Yet many of the basic concepts employed in the interpretive and theoretical arguments, concepts developed and legitimized by other scholars whose works are well known, are not cited at the point where they

are first used, if at all. On page 54, for instance, Craton writes: "[Slave] drivers were measured on a scale of reputations; they were therefore not as attracted as other elite slaves by the canons of respectability." Any reader steeped in Caribbean literature will immediately recognize those terms and their specific use here as coming from Peter Wilson's *Crab Antics*, an anthropological monograph concerned with the contemporary Caribbean, and developing an argument about the complementary notions of reputation and respectability. But having used the terms as if they were his own, why does Craton wait until page 248 to cite Wilson? Were this an isolated case, it would matter little. But if it was Craton's intention to clarify where he got the concepts useful to him in developing his arguments for this book, then he has failed resoundingly.

What of the book itself? When put in the context of Craton's earlier works, such as *A Jamaican plantation* (co-authored with James Walvin), this is a keen disappointment. Here, substance and theory are unconvincingly combined, largely because the interpretations do not grow out of the data, but are derived instead, higgledy-piggledy, from the works of others. Information on individual instances of collective resistance, many abortive, is summarized; the putative wellsprings of such resistance are discussed; and the panorama of "slave-life" is briefly displayed. But things do not hang together; and an eleven-page epilogue fails entirely to improve matters. What mournful one-upsmanship we have here! For those "progressive historians" for whom "there is no doubt; true revolution will surely emerge, sooner rather than later, if not as a result, then as an ideal expression and fit conclusion of the people's struggle," Craton offers dire enlightenment:

The people's perennial struggle against their oppressors does not require an external program. It is not necessarily progressive . . . slaves always resisted slavery and the plantation system, rebelling where they could or had to. Their aim was freedom to make, or to recreate, a life of their own in the circumstances in which they found themselves — an aim that placed them alongside all unfree people throughout history their own descendants. The circumstances gradually changed, of course, but subject chiefly to an intrinsic, not extrinsic logic. As this book has argued, the first African slaves brought with them to the Caribbean age-tested techniques of combating slavery, indigenous fighting traditions, and memories of political systems that kept their homeland free from a general European takeover until the end of the nineteenth century. In the New World they assimilated, or unconsciously

replicated, Amerindian techniques of resistance, subtle as well as open . . . We do not aim to glamorize the struggling masses. Ordinary people are rarely heroic, often confused, and almost invariably selfish. Their ideology, though definable, is rarely conscious. When they revolt, they are likely to be as savage and as revengeful as their opponents. Yet the time has surely come for history to be written from the perspective of the majority rather than from that of more eloquent elites — be they the original bourgeois master class, their independentist successors, or even an intellectual Socialist vanguard.

A Socialist revolution may indeed be just around the corner for the British Caribbean. But if the message of this book rings true, the people will resist oppression by a totalitarian communism just as vigorously as any other form of slave regime. What characterizes, defines, the common people is the way in which they will always test the chains of their oppression. If we accept in its fullest sense Herbert Aptheker's dictum that resistance, not acquiescence, is the core of history (and there must be some doubt that Aptheker himself, as a good Marxist, meant it quite that way), then resistance, surely, cannot have a stop [pages 330–334, *passim*].

Though these are selected passages from the epilogue, they display the lines of an argument Craton carries on in his book with opponents (several of them now dead) whose positions he has undertaken to outline and to criticize. As I suggested earlier, such fiddling about with what Craton has chosen to define as “socialist” or “Marxist” detracts from the book, for the historical substance itself seems neither to support such a position (as Craton has defined it), nor to vitiate it. One is left puzzled at best. If the book is dedicated (as it is) to a convinced Socialist or Marxist, as Walter Rodney was, one might ask whom we are honoring, and whom we are one-upping, by noting that the regime in Guyana responsible for his death calls itself a “Co-operative Socialist Republic”? Who is to write history from the perspective of the majority? Is Craton really so sure of his Marxism that when Aptheker says resistance is the core of history, Craton can claim that he is *not* being a good Marxist? What, after all, is this sanctimonious “and-you’re-another” all about?

Patterson's *Slavery and social death* poses wholly different challenges to the reader. In 1900, when Herman Jeremias Nieboer, a Dutch comparative sociologist, published his *Slavery as an industrial system*, he was attempting to enumerate “the conditions necessary for the success of slavery as an industrial system, and the inverse conditions under which slave labour must give way to free labour” (1900:xx1). Patterson points out that his own work in contrast, is

"a global analysis of the institution of slavery" (p. xi), the first since Nieboer and — if we accept the above distinction — perhaps the first ever.

Patterson's book is divided into three parts: (I) the internal relations of slavery, (II) slavery as an institutional process, and (III) the dialectics of slavery. Each part is composed of chapters (twelve in all) concentrated principally in Part II. But the introduction, on the constituent (a word enjoying an astounding vogue!) elements of slavery, precedes the parts. Patterson says of slavery that it is "... not ... a static entity, but ... a complex interactional process, one laden with tension and contradiction in the dynamics of each of its constituent elements" (p. 13). In his view, the slave state is a power relation, "one of the most extreme forms of the relation of the domination" (p. 1). This power relation has three facets: the use or threat of violence (physical); influence (psychological); and authority, which "lay in those 'conventions' which today we would call culture" (p. 2). Each facet of power, Patterson argues, has three sets of constituent features, which can be summarized as the threat of naked force, the slave's natal alienation, and the "socio-psychological aspect" of powerlessness/dishonor. Patterson's preliminary definition: slavery is the permanent, violent domination of natively alienating and generally dishonored persons (p. 13).

All this, mind you, before the book has really begun. If, then, one stops momentarily to wonder to what end Patterson sought to transcend time, place, and degree without exception, the pause may be worthwhile. Patterson's aim was to write about all slavery — all *slaveries*. Accordingly, he went looking for what I can only think of describing as "the real thing," the essence, of one kind of relation of dominance. Out of anthropologist G. P. Murdock's 186 sample cultures, Patterson settled on sixty-six to study.³ But he did not stop there. Somewhat defensively, he writes that his statistical analysis was "always regarded as a *supplementary analytical device*" (p. 347). Moreover, the societies listed in other appendices — and they are long lists — "do not exhaust the number of cases studied" (*ibid.*)

This ambitious search has impressed many readers and specialists. But what Patterson can deliver that is both generally valid

and new, about an institution on which he has managed the aggregation of data from so many different societies, requires scrutiny. He concludes his initial discussion thus:

While the constituent elements of slavery are the same for all kinds of social orders, the fact remains that this specific configuration of elements will be *understood differently* in different socioeconomic systems. Any attempt to understand comparatively the nature of slavery, or any other social process, if it is to take account of such contextual variations, must remain of limited value [pp. 26-27, italics added].

Much later, he returns to this problem, but less cautiously, for now he is looking ahead to future developments:

... in the very process of defending the viability of our criteria for identifying slavery, we have already hinted at its limitation, which is its schematism. Such schematism has its place in any comparative science of history and society. . . . It is the essential heavy plow that must first clear the ground, turn the rough soil, and demarcate the boundaries. An analysis becomes defective not by its use, but by its exclusive use, by failure to recognize what it reveals: that the ground underneath differs from the pebbles and rocks above [p. 332].

There is nothing here with which to quarrel, it seems to me; but one is entitled to ask whether the search for an immanent definition leaves us knowing more than we did before. We may conclude that Patterson's search is worthwhile, even if we differ with his findings or his methods at one point or another. Yet whether the findings are proportional in weight to the voluminous research on which they are based is not an easy question, and it may not be answered for some time — if ever. It depends in part on whether one believes such sweeping cross-cultural research can really provide important insights, disengaging as it must each cluster of "facts" about slavery from its historical, institutional, and cultural context.

The study of slavery by scholars in the Americas during the past century has been dominated by interest in what Philip Curtin long ago dubbed the South Atlantic system, which tied together the slave trade, the plantation system, and the commodity trade to both Europe and Africa. The associations between Africans and slavery, between slavery and agro-industrial production, and between capitalism and unfree (but "paraproletarian") slaves

have always been the substance of this system. To the extent that scholars of slavery have linked it unthinkingly only with this Hemisphere and with the South Atlantic system, they were treating as universal features what were in fact historically and spatially specific and limited. It is to Patterson's credit that he has worked hard to broaden that relatively narrow perspective, aided particularly in his comparative work by the breadth that study with classicist Moses Finley provided.

Patterson's wide-ranging comparisons convince him that not only can the slavery institution be universally defined — freed from its context in particular cases — but also that its component features, as they figure in his definition, can be nearly everywhere identified. One of those features is dishonor. He firmly concludes that being a slave is dishonorable. The slave *cannot* have honor; in societies with slaves and masters, the master's honor and the slave's dishonor are cognate and interdependent. Even where slaves are (or can become) politically powerful figures, they remain dishonored. This thread in Patterson's argument is eventually linked to yet another: the anomalous (and therefore mediative) status of socially marginal persons. The latter argument is advanced most powerfully in the discussion of the eunuch — as slave, agent of the monarch, mediator between social categories, and creature without honor.

Attracted (seduced, almost) by certain arguments in so-called symbolic anthropology which deal with pollution, anomaly, and power, Patterson develops the argument that eunuchs were the choicest expression of royal status, yet they were persons (perhaps non-persons) to whom none of that power might adhere. His arguments are entertaining and imaginative. But I found it difficult to align usefully such examples of slavery systems with others, such as the U.S. South or Brazil, simply because the systems happen to share Patterson's constituent elements. That is because I believe that it is only if we really understand how some particular society in which the slaves lived and suffered was organized, can any "constitutive elements" reveal to us what the slaves were compelled to forgo. I would argue that if we want to understand what slavery is, in any particular instance, it is not enough to be guided by what Patterson has decided to consider its

lowest sociopsychological common denominator. Are we really to believe that all slaves, everywhere and always, were dishonored? That the masters's honor and the slave's dishonor everywhere and always were cognate and interdependent? That all slaves who became politically powerful figures, everywhere and always remained dishonored? This asks a good deal, I think, of even the complaisant reader.

By choosing his particular diagnostic traits, Patterson has helped to "universalize" his definition; but he has come close to psychologizing it as well. This is ironic, for at several points he proclaims piously that he is no psychologist, implying that this somehow makes his analysis more objective. Thus, for instance: "As always indicated, I am concerned with discussing the problem of honor relative to the *political psychology* of slavery, not with problems of *human personality* — on which I can offer neither theoretical expertise nor relevant data" (p. 367 n. 41, italics added). The distinction is doubtless entirely clear to Patterson, but it may be to all of his readers. How one can objectively analyze honor and dishonor as "external" aspects of the master-slave relationship — as "political psychology" ("The honoring of the master and the dishonoring of the slave were the outward product of their interaction" — p. 11), yet remain completely cavalier about any attempt to get inside the individual's view of him/herself, is not explained to the reader. To be sure, I am as pessimistic as Patterson about the latter possibility; but I am somewhat less sanguine than he about the former. I sense in Patterson's scientific optimism here a poorly-concealed impatience with historical particularism, masquerading partly as dislike for pop psychology. One can sympathize with the dislike without pardoning the impatience.

Though psychologizing won't do, apparently anthropologizing will. It is refreshing to find a sociologist who cites (and, clearly, reads) other anthropologists besides Clifford Geertz and Claude Lévi-Strauss. But an uncritical acceptance of such concepts as liminality, anomaly, pollution, and the notion of symbolic mediation can result in occasional excess, as well as sneaking in some psychologizing under a different name.⁴

If one were to offer a basic reservation about this book's

orientation (a reservation in no way invalidating its value but pondering the whole enterprise), I suggest that it might go something like the following. By defining an institution in a manner facilitating its study without reference to cultural boundaries, to historical particulars, or even to other social institutions within the same case, one runs the risk of amputating insight into the relationships between the goals of that institution, and those of any other with which it is allied. That risk is a real one. It does not diminish what we learn from Patterson's exercise; but it should make clear that exercise it is. Thus, for example, though there are a few references to women in *Slavery and social death*, they are not numerous or lengthy. (The index lists four citations by page; they are to Byzantium, China and the U.S. South.) Yet the relationship between the slavery institution and the status of women, both slave and free, is an immensely useful "litmus" of the institutional apparatus and of the values it embodies, in particular cases.⁵ Similarly useful, of course, are materials on age distinctions, and on other bases of social assortment; and while Patterson has certainly added something to our understanding of the links among such features, he is always pulled back by his overall design to his constitutive elements. That slavery oppressed is certain. But what did it oppress *with*; who else was oppressed, in this and in other ways; *what else* in the system oppressed, together with slavery? The nature of social institutions inheres in social relationships, as Patterson understood well; but is not the relationship among institutions essential to the complete understanding of any one of them, within a single system?

Finally, it may bear saying that one of the most interesting things about these books may not even have crossed the minds of their authors. It is the apparently unavoidable presence of Marxist thinking in the contemporary historiography of slavery, a presence which bedevils those who are hostile to it, quite as much as it inspires its protagonists. Neither Craton nor Patterson is anything but eclectic about this source of ideas and explanation; yet both seem to find its influence seductive. Craton is repelled, but as if it were Eve with the apple; Patterson's reactions are more complex and less ambivalent, but also less disingenuous. What does this

mean? Why should these serious scholars, one a historian and the other a sociologist (and neither, so far as I know, a Marxist), devote so much energy to one critical perspective?

I think this reflects the important contributions that Marxist thinking has made to the modern understanding of slavery, in all its many institutional implications. Though there has been in recent years a vogue for this perspective, in no other topic of interest to historians has the shift to the importance of Marxist reflection been quite as telling. Slavery had forcefully caught the attention of Marx himself, concerned as he was with forms of labor and their place in the evolution of economic systems. His comments on slavery and slave labor, particularly in the then-modern nineteenth-century world, are precious (even if sometimes demonstrably wrong or uncertain). Interest in the slavery institution, then, was initiated by the first Marxist (though he disliked the label) of them all. What is striking is that for the better part of a century, no one, neither Marxist nor anti-Marxist, took up the questions Marx himself had sketched out, to advance our knowledge or to test Marx's line of argument. The reason must surely have been that no one thought it was intellectually worthwhile.

NOTES

1. Many thanks to Jacqueline Mintz and Dr. Sally Price for important queries and criticisms.
2. Perhaps Craton meant to refer to Taylor's discussion of Voorhoeve's 1970 and 1973 papers comparing loanword derivations in Sranan, Saramaccan, and Djuka (based on Swadesh's 200-item wordlist), which Taylor reduced to percentages (Taylor 1977: 6). But those percentages are two, three, and five percent, not ten percent; and none of these languages is or was spoken in the British West Indies.
3. Though it is not relevant to Patterson's particular findings so much as to his methodology, it may be of passing interest that Professor Murdock, in a remarkable lecture before the Royal Anthropological Society, repudiated virtually everything in American anthropological theory based on the concepts of culture and social system — including his own work. See Murdock 1971.
4. One amusing example will do. Patterson is not as skeptical as he is zealous. Gripped by the realization that dirt and the sacred are locked in some inescapable psychological balance, he discovers that his anomalous, powerful-

but-dirty, sacred-but-dishonorable eunuchs were also supposedly incontinent, and notes the Chinese belief that they "reeked so of urine that one could smell them from 300 meters" (p. 321). He then rather insouciantly links this finding to a passing assertion of classicist René Guerdan concerning the nickname of a Constantine emperor. Citing Guerdan, he writes: "All Byzantine emperors had nicknames, most of them insulting. In view of the bed-wetting and smell of the eunuchs, and the identification of the emperor with his chief eunuch, the nickname by which one of the Constantines was known throughout his life becomes doubly significant: he was called 'Copronymus,' which means 'the pisser'" (p. 328). There is a marvelous howler concealed here. When I turned to Guerdan's original French text, however, it corroborated the English-language version Patterson had used: "*Un certain Constantin avait eu le malheur de souiller les fonts baptismaux: le voilà pour la vie, surnommé 'Copronyme' (le pisseur).*" Now, to begin with, the nickname reflected directly upon the emperor (who himself soiled the baptismal font), not via association with bed-wetting eunuchs. But this aside, the nickname itself is incorrectly translated. Why Guerdan, a Frenchman, decided to be so improbably delicate is unclear to me; but if the meaning of Copronymus is "pisser," then my name is — mud. And so a flight of imaginative association that needed urine for fuel has been grounded by a few feces. Patterson should not be cast down; this is not the first time in the annals of symbolic anthropology that a pretty young symbolic theory has been stabbed in the back by an ugly old etymological fact.

5. In 1803, Pierre-Edouard Lemontey wrote a satire on the Société des Observateurs de l'Homme, in which the Society offers a prize of a gold chain for the *worst* essay on the justification for enslaving women. The Society receives 468 entries; the prizewinning very worst is by a Jamaican planter by the name of Dominic Hangman. It begins with the following: "The slavery of women is justified by reasons as good as those for the slavery of Negroes." The winner, laying hold of his prize, tosses it to his poor wife, saying: "Here, Madame, I promised it to you, so certain was I of my victory" (Moore 1969: 49). Some acute students of slavery have looked at this question more seriously, among them John Stuart Mill (1977 [1869]). I would hazard the guess that the relationship between the position of female slaves and the position of free women is a vital key, in societies of a certain type, to understanding the nature of slavery in those societies.

REFERENCES

- GUERDAN, RENE, 1954. *Vie, grandeurs et misères de Byzance*. Paris, Plon.
- MILL, JOHN STUART, 1977 [1869]. *The subjection of women*. Cambridge MA, M.I.T. Press.
- MOORE, F. G. T., 1969. Translator's introduction to J.-M. Degérando, *The observation of savage peoples*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- MURDOCK, GEORGE P., 1971. Anthropology's mythology. *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. London, Royal Anthropological Institute, pp. 17-24.

NIEBOER, HERMAN JEREMIAS, 1900. *Slavery as an industrial system*. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff.

SAGO, JOSE ANTONIO, 1936 [1883]. *Historia de la esclavitud desde los tiempos más remotos hasta nuestros días*. La Habana, Editorial Alfa.

TAYLOR, DOUGLAS MACRAE, 1977. *Languages of the West Indies*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

SIDNEY W. MINTZ
Department of Anthropology
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore MD 21218, U.S.A.

C. L. R. JAMES: A CONCURRING DISSENT

Spheres of existence: selected writings. C. L. R. JAMES. Westport CT: Lawrence Hill, 1980. 264 pp. (Paper US\$ 7.95)

This volume continues the collected edition of the work of C. L. R. James put out by the London publishing house of Allison and Busby. The volumes, put together, constitute a memorial to James and his work which started with his emigration to England in the early 1930s and continued with his various residencies in Africa, the United States, and the Caribbean. His collected writings reveal him as a man for all seasons, for he has written with equal ease in half a dozen fields of journalistic and scholarly enquiry: Caribbean and African Third World politics, Marxist-Leninist political thought, Western philosophy, literary criticism, Pan-Africanism, Caribbean nationalism, cricket, and history — in fact an enormous range of interests. Most people would have been satisfied with a career concerned just with one of them. The reasons, perhaps, are easy to identify. In part, it is because James has also been throughout a political activist, never forgetting, like a true Marxist, that there must always be an alliance between the worker by hand and the worker by brain. In part, it is because, like so many others, his has not been a mind spoiled by a modern university education, so that his intellectual self has nothing about it of the habit of academic specialization in which the individual scholar concerns himself only with his own "field," ignoring everything else that lies beyond. James is the humanist, trained as the all-rounder. It is always an exciting pleasure to read him, not least of all when one disagrees with him.

Those of us who have been practitioners in Caribbean studies owe him, as we also owe Eric Williams and Fernando Ortiz and Jean Price-Mars, a great debt. His early piece on Captain Cripiani started the long argument for West Indian independence. His 1938 essay, *The history of Negro revolt*, saw perceptively that Caribbean resistance to colonialism was a logical, coherent historical process, starting with the slave revolts and ending, at that time, with the Garveyite movement. The classic *Black Jacobins*, of the same year, documented the lesson that slavery emancipation was not simply, as Williams' *Capitalism and Slavery* argued, the end-result of impersonal economic factors but, much more, the consequence of mass revolutionary instinct; although that work has long been superseded by the later French and Haitian scholarship on the St-Domingue rebellion. Not least of all, his *State Capitalism and World Revolution* volume of 1950 gathered together his general dialectical view on the world as a whole as it had developed between the Russian Revolution of 1917 and World War Two, especially important for those of us, as Europeans, who had also felt the tremendous impact of the great debate on revolution, war, imperialism, and Fascism that characterized the mental climate of that seminal period. Like every original thinker, James has married a long and rich personal experience with a coherent philosophy, for he knows that experience without philosophy is meaningless.

The collected items in this particular volume show him, again, at his best in the tradition, so English, of the essayist, at times analytical, at times polemical, always stimulating. Any more than the great practitioners of that literary form James does not hide his light under a bushel; as much as Addison or Charles Lamb or G. K. Chesterton or George Orwell he presents his prides and prejudices with a fierce independency of mind and spirit. He can write the effective short story, as his selections from his early Trinidadian writings show. He has a sense of people; his piece on a London street encounter with Paul Robeson is hilarious, all the more so since hilarity is not always his strong point. As an older man he is generous to young writers, as his 1950 piece on the young Norman Mailer and William Gardner Smith demonstrates. He is always good at literary criticism, especially Shakes-

perean, although the reader is tempted to say, here, that it is criticism in the conventional English sense, for it seems at times that James does not realize that Shakesperean criticism has advanced a lot since the time when Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch was writing some eighty years ago. His piece on the great sports figure of Learie Constantine is affectionate; although, again, the non-English reader will wonder why James, so Marxist, should possess such an admiring passion for cricket, which is, after all, the sport of the English gentleman class, although, as we know, things are different in the West Indies.

It is interesting to note that in his piece on the books of the English leftwing writer Raymond Williams he charges Williams with suffering from English insularity. Yet James himself has not been completely immune to that disease. That is evident enough, I suggest, from the two more specifically Caribbean pieces in this anthology: "The West Indian Middle Classes" and "The making of the Caribbean people." The first piece is almost a Fanonesque diatribe against the West Indian middle class which overlooks, first, the fact that the same class provided the leadership of the trade union and labor party movements after 1938, often at much personal sacrifice, and, second, the fact that the middle class record, especially of the student groups, in the Hispanic Antilles has been far more progressive than James' sweeping denunciatory generalizations make credit for. The second piece, again, is almost wholly anglophone in reference, except when the author quotes extensively from his own book on St-Domingue, with no reference at all to the long thirty-years war between 1868 and 1898 of the Cuban revolutionary forces against Spain, without which, it goes without saying, no essay on the making of the Caribbean people can be complete. In sum, for all of his Marxism and anti-colonialism James, at bottom, psychologically, is the intractable anglophile, a London man, so to speak, almost as much as Vidia Naipaul, so removed, ideologically, as they are one from the other. As Eric Williams has pointed out somewhere, the West Indian intelligentsia of the interwar 1919-1939 period can be divided between those who elected to stay at home with the anti-colonial struggle and those who elected to leave and join the international revolutionary circuit.

But James was not only on that circuit. It is vital to an understanding of his collected work that whether in Britain or the U.S. or even in the West Indies he was always on the fringe, rarely in the mainstream. He belonged to the minority sectarian groups: the Revolutionary Socialist League in Britain, the Socialist Workers Party in the U.S., the Trotskyite Fourth International, and even his own splinter group from the latter. Much of his writing, inevitably, bears the mark of ideological sectarianism arising out of all the splits and schisms characteristic of all sectarian debate and conflict. In much of that debate, of course, he was eminently right. He was among the first to see that the Soviet Union, under Stalin, had become the revolution betrayed. His long essay in this volume, "After Hitler, our turn," is a brilliant analysis of how the German Communist Party after 1929 allowed itself to be deluded by the policy line, dictated from Moscow, that the real enemy was not Hitler but the "socialist-fascist" socialists and social democrats, and that in the coming struggle for power they would play the role of Lenin, and Hitler the role of Kerensky: a fatal diagnosis stemming from the prevalent official thesis of the Communist parties of the time that every revolution should uncritically follow the patterns set by Russia in 1917. It was, as James says, a dreadful record of stupidity and crime, rooted in the oriental idolatry that Stalin demanded from all of the dependent communist movements.

But this same volume shows that James himself was not innocent of his own ideological mistakes. His essay on Black Power correctly reminds us that this was no sudden eruption but a historic process that had its roots in the work of Du Bois and Garvey; yet at the same time it has a eulogy of Stokeley Carmichael that is almost embarrassing in its fulsomeness and, worse, almost embraces the cult of personality which has so bedevilled the black American struggle. There are times when the reader is not quite sure exactly where James stands on the vexed question of the proper balance between the twin lodestars of Race and Class in the revolutionary struggle; but his assertion in 1962 that "it is from the American working class that we can as Marxists expect the greatest advance in socialist action and socialist ideas" (page 120) cannot but sound like rosy optimism to anyone who knows

anything firsthand about the white working-class strongholds of South Boston or the west Chicago suburbs. Or, yet again, there are problems with James' reading of the whole Marxist-Leninist revolutionary literature. It is his main thesis, in the piece on "After Hitler, our turn," that Stalinism betrayed the original Leninist doctrine. Yet it is equally arguable that Leninism was itself a betrayal of the original Marxist doctrine, insofar as the Leninist idea of a separate communist party, a vanguard cadre, had no place in the thought of either Marx or Engels; and it was Rosa Luxembourgh, not Lenin, who remained loyal to the early democratic system in her famous quarrel with Lenin and her criticism of the "ultra-centralism" of the Leninist ideas on party organization. Interestingly, James in this volume makes only one brief reference to Rosa Luxembourgh, and only to note the fact of her murder. All of the internecine fratricidal struggle, the ideological factionalism, the splits and internal power struggles that James deplores are as much traceable to the Leninist concept of the disciplined communist party as the custodian of the revolution, as against all others, as they are traceable to the Stalinist gloss on the Leninist texts.

It is, indeed, the danger of the Leninist concept of the party that it leads, easily, to a concurrent concept of the party leader. It thus generates the hero-cult, as with Lenin himself, Mao-Tse-Tung, Fidel Castro, and others. In similar fashion, a sort of James cult has grown up in the Third World movements, acclaiming him as the *guru* who knows the secrets. His disciples speak of him almost as if he were divinity itself. Yet surely, like all of us, he has his limitations. His Leninist concept of the party as chosen vanguard is dangerous since it is at bottom anti-democratic. When he writes on Pan-Africanism or the Caribbean as a single nation he seems to be over-romantic in his expectations. He can see meaning in things — such as the novels of Wilson Harris — where others only see an almost completely unreadable author who loses himself in the upper stratosphere of myth and metaphysics. The editors of this volume tell us, again, that in 1939 he agitated among American blacks to oppose the world war (page iv). One wonders what James thinks would have happened had the Axis powers won that war; on any showing, it would have meant that the

blacks of the New World would have followed the Jews of the Old World into a second Holocaust: after the Jews, the blacks. His dislike of what he calls "bourgeois intellectuals" can lead him at times into a dangerous anti-intellectualism, as in his sweeping statement that the analysis of work is "a practical problem for practical people, who are not given to writing books" (page 126) a truly astonishing observation when one remembers all of the working-class people in the progressive movements all over who have written their own books, going back at least to the English Chartist worker-authors of the early Victorian period. There are times, indeed, when it seems to the reader that James is sometimes capable of playing to the gallery, of affecting a contempt for the socialists of the chair: an attitude, perhaps, that comes almost naturally to a self-educated revolutionary more at home in the art of the public platform than in the art of the academic classroom.

And yet it is not merely a matter of content. It is also a matter of manner. For all of his intellectual gifts it takes a great deal of patience to read James. His literary style is peculiar, to say the least. He rambles. He lectures. He pontificates. He parades all of his learning, even when it is irrelevant to the topic at hand. He is given to large prophetic utterances, almost as if he were some Mosaic leader announcing the truth to his people. He cannot resist intruding his own person in whatever narrative or analysis he is undertaking. There is almost a schizophrenic personality at work here: on the one hand, he is the Marxist theoretician, analyzing in scientific terms the general revolutionary process; on the other hand he is the bourgeois individualistic *savant*, immersed, as much as Eric Williams, in his own inward hunger. All of this, finally, is couched in a truly Johnsonian ponderosity of style; it seems at times to the reader that James is like nothing so much as a battleship attempting to turn around in a duckpond.

Human nature being what it is, it is only too easy to understand how the literary or the personality cult develops. One would to have the true humility of the saint, like St. Francis of Assisi, to resist it. But the habit of the cult corrupts both the hero-figure who is idealized and the applauding crowd who join in the chorus. It is the duty of the sceptic to resist the temptation to join in; one is reminded of the spirited refusal of the American critic Edmund

Wilson, in his essay, "A dissenting opinion on Kafka," to accept that overrated writer as either a great artist or a moral guide. One could write a similar essay on the Bloomsbury cult or the George Orwell cult. For the best part of his long life James has splendidly served the world progressive cause, both black and white, in a variety of ways: as union organizer, as party propagandist, as adviser to Third World governments, and not least of all as shaper of systemic thought. It is right and proper that we should admire. But we do not have to worship.

GORDON K. LEWIS
Institute of Caribbean Studies
University of Puerto Rico
Rio Piedras PR 00931, U.S.A.

CREOLES — TOO MUCH TOO SOON?

Historicity and variation in creole studies. ARNOLD HIGHFIELD & ALBERT VALDMAN (eds.), Ann Arbor MI: Karoma Publishers, 1981. xi + 126 pp. (Cloth US\$ 14.50, Paper US\$ 10.50)

Generative studies on creole languages. PIETER MUYSKEN (ed.). Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications, 1980. vii + 221 pp. (Paper Dfl. 40.00, US\$ 20.00)

The social context of creolization. ELLEN WOOLFORD & WILLIAM WASHABAUGH (eds.). Ann Arbor MI: Karoma Publishers, 1983. 149 pp. (Paper US\$ 12.50, Cloth US\$ 15.50)

Ten years elapsed between the appearance of the first collection of papers on pidgins and creoles (Le Page 1961) and the second (Hymes 1971). That such volumes should now be appearing almost annually must say something about what is often referred to as the "burgeoning field" of creole studies. It would be nice to be able to report that quality had kept pace with quantity. Alas, the papers in all three collections, with few exceptions, are at best taxonomic, and at worst, pedestrian reinventions of the wheel.

If the Trade Descriptions Act extended to book titles, the reader could bring suit in at least two cases. Of the nine contributors to the Muysken volume, five (Akers, Corne, Muhlhauser, Voorhoeve, and Washabaugh) could only be called generativists under the most liberal interpretation of that term; while out of the seven contributions to the Woolford-Washabaugh volume, the three longest, adding up to a clear 70% of the content,

deal with the social context of *pidginization*, not creolization. To deal fully with the twenty-odd individual articles included in the three volumes would be beyond the scope of this review, so I will concentrate on those that are directly relevant to the student of Caribbean creoles.

Of the three collections, the Woolford-Washabaugh volume holds least for the Caribbeanist, quality- as well as quantity-wise. In addition to three papers on Pacific pidgins by Clark, Muhlhauser and Dutton, which provide much interesting historical data not easily accessible elsewhere, it contains "The development of Atlantic Creole languages" by Washabaugh and Greenfield (misleadingly titled also, since it deals only with Cyprus and the Portuguese island colonies off the African coast), "The origin and development of four creoles in the Gulf of Guinea" by Ferraz (5½ pages of disconnected comparisons between creoles and African languages) and two more general papers, Woolford's "Social context of creolization" and Polome's "Creolization and language change." Polome does little beyond repeating the caveats against assuming prior creolization as a cause of historical change in non-creole languages which he first gave in Valdman and Highfield 1980. Woolford's contribution, which stands as introduction to the volume, simply summarizes, in a superficial and platitudinous manner, those ideas about the sociolinguistics of creoles that were already current in the early 1970s. What is to date the most seminal work on the social context of any creole, Baker and Corne 1982, is not once cited by any of the contributors, although it was, ironically, published by the same firm that published the Woolford-Washabaugh volume!

The Highfield-Valdman volume contains four papers relating to West Indian creoles: "Decreolization in a creole continuum: "Belize" (Escure), "Guadeloupean Creole pronouns" (Morgan), "Identifying the African grammatical base of the Caribbean creoles" (Baudet), and "Sociolinguistic history and the creolist" (Holm). Both the Morgan and Holm papers are narrow taxonomic studies. Morgan compares the morphonemic shapes, not the syntax or semantics, of Guadeloupean pronouns with those of other French creoles; Holm catalogs the English regional origins of words in the lexicon of Miskito Coast Creole. These papers,

limited in scope though they are, at least tell us things we may not have known before; those by Escure and Baudet simply repeat earlier studies in ways less revealing than their models. Escure perpetuates the view of a creole continuum as simply the mixture of two discrete varieties which are functionally equivalent, a view that had been thoroughly discredited by the mid-1970s. Baudet follows a still older recipe: take a sprinkling of surface forms from assorted creoles, a sprinkling of surface forms from assorted African languages, arrange in parallel layers, and serve cold; do not spice with any argument. Papers such as these not only fail to advance creolistics, they do it a positive disservice, providing instant discouragement for any bright students who may have been inveigled into sampling the field by assurances that it is "new" and "exciting."

In this company, the Muysken volume stands out, although it is well below most Foris publications in terms of depth and rigor. Its Caribbean-related items are: "Admissibility conditions on final consonant clusters in the Jamaican continuum" (Akers), "Multifunctionality as a derivational problem" (Voorhoeve), "Pursuing creole roots" (Washabaugh), "Creole tense/mood/aspect systems: the unmarked case?" (Muysken), and "Haitian Creole *pu*" (Koopman and Lefebvre). In addition, there are papers by Corne on predicates in the Mascarene creoles, by den Besten on WH-movement in Afrikaans, and by Muhlhauser and Woolford on Tok Pisin (dealing with number and complementizers, respectively).

Akers' paper is a solid study of variation in Jamaican final consonant clusters. As elsewhere, the basilect has rigorous restrictions on co-occurrence of final consonants which are gradually relaxed across the continuum; Akers provides the first detailed and formal analysis of this relaxation, standing in sharp contrast to Escure's paper reviewed above. I hope that some generativists will read it; it might just cure them of their belief that linguistic variation is Morris Halle speaking five languages (Chomsky 1979: 56), although I doubt it.

Voorhoeve, whose recent and untimely death will be regretted by creolist and Caribbeanist alike, confronts the problem of determining, among the homophonous nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. of

Sranan, which is the basic and which the derived form. He doesn't get very far with it, in part because he concentrates on showing how actual derivations might have come about, rather than on why absolute multifunctionality (in which any lexical item can belong to any category) should have constraints on it, and what these constraints are. At least, one might try to distinguish between accidental and non-accidental gaps (for example, verbs of motion don't seem to yield transitive verbs or adjectives). But Voorhoeve's paper is just a first shot at a tricky and, perhaps, not really very revealing area.

Yet again, with Washabaugh, we encounter the misleading title. His paper is not about the origins of creoles but about the distribution of motion-verbs functioning as quasi-complementizers in Providencia-San Andres and other creoles. Washabaugh is essentially correct in assuming that these "complementizers" began life as full-fledged serial verbs (a status which, he points out, they still have in Saramaccan, a creole yet more conservative than that of Providencia-San Andres). However, in a set of "conclusions" which have little or nothing to do with what went before, he supports an Alleyanian "substratum" approach to creoles against a universalist one — this in a paper where he actually cites sentences from Hawaiian creole involving quasi-complementizer *go* and points out their similarity to Caribbean creole sentences!

Muysken is equally hostile to a universalist approach, although his grounds are as evanescent as Washabaugh's. I have already commented at some length on the quality of the data which Muysken adduces in support of his case (Bickerton 1981: 73-77); I will confine myself here to his arguments, which are strangely muddled. For instance, on p. 190, he claims that "in the Creole languages, only unmarked distinctions appear," and on p. 191 he declares that "hence, the emergence of the feature anterior as the prime tense category in earlier Creole auxiliary systems would be predicted." One might suppose that between these two pronouncements there would be an argument showing that anterior was an unmarked category. But what there actually is is an argument which shows that "past perfect" — the nearest thing in Muysken's list of "universal" (?) tense categories to anterior, although he makes no attempt whatsoever to explain or even

point out the relationship — is the *most* marked of four realis categories and the second most marked out of all tense categories! But it doesn't matter; two or three pages later, Muysken seems to have forgotten that he ever claimed anterior as unmarked, for he is busily trying to show that many creoles don't in fact have anterior tense. And so it goes.

The best paper is the last. Koopman and Lefebvre deal with the Haitian complementizer *pu* in considerable depth and detail and give a wide range of examples, relating it to its modal and prepositional functions, and claiming that the complementizer function developed from the modal one, rather than vice versa. They are surely right in the negative, but not so surely in the positive conclusion. The widespread existence, in the most disparate creoles, of complementizer or quasi-complementizer forms derived from *for*, *pour*, *para* suggests that this is unlikely to be a recent development, as Koopman and Lefebvre's arguments would suggest, while the absence or rarity of complementizer *pu* in earlier texts may simply reflect deficiencies of those texts. In other words, it is impossible now, if indeed it ever was, to do creolistics with individual creoles — so many problems which seem opaque in isolation become transparent when comparative data is taken into account. However, the authors do have an eye for the larger issues, as they show in the last few pages of their article, in which they discuss with considerable insight some of the abstract conditions governing the development of creoles.

However, the Muysken volume as a whole is very uneven. It should probably be read (with caution) by any hard-core creolist, but its lack of any systematic perspective (despite the confident pronouncements of Muysken's introduction) and the disparate nature of the problems surveyed will only confuse the neophyte or the interested observer from other fields. Moreover, two of the nine articles have appeared elsewhere in identical or closely similar form: Woolford's in Hill 1979 and Koopman and Lefebvre's in Lefebvre, Magloire-Holly and Piou 1982. The appeal of the other two volumes reviewed is still more limited, as suggested above. I might add that none of the volumes had an index, although Woolford-Washabaugh and Highfield-Valdman do at least have a single bibliography for the volume, instead of a separate one for each paper, as Muysken's does.

REFERENCES

- BAKER, PHILIP & CHRIS CORNE, 1982. *Isle-de-France Creole*. Ann Arbor, Karoma.
- BICKERTON, DEREK, 1981. *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor, Karoma.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM, 1979. *Language and responsibility*. New York, Pantheon.
- HILL, KENNETH C. (ed.), 1979. *The genesis of language*. Ann Arbor, Karoma.
- HYMES, DELL (ed.), 1971. *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- LEFEBVRE, CLAIRE, HELENE MAGLOIRE-HOLLY & NANIE PIOUS (eds.), 1982. *Syntaxe de l'Haitien*. Ann Arbor, Karoma.
- LE PAGE, ROBERT B. (ed.), 1961. *Creole language studies*. London, Macmillan.
- VALDMAN, ALBERT & ARNOLD HIGHFIELD (eds.), 1980. *Theoretical orientations in creole studies*. New York, Academic Press.

DEREK BICKERTON
Department of Linguistics
University of Hawaii
Honolulu HI 96882, U.S.A.

BOOK REVIEWS

Flash of the spirit: African and Afro-American art and philosophy.
ROBERT FARRIS THOMPSON. New York: Random House, 1983.
xvii + 317 pp. (Cloth US\$ 19.95)

Within the larger context of art and aesthetics in the Americas, the contributions made by peoples of African descent have gone largely unnoticed or unappreciated by serious scholars in the fields of both anthropology and (especially) art history. For this reason, Robert Farris Thompson's recent study of Afro-American art and philosophy — a work conceived with sensitivity, and presented in provocative prose — is a welcome addition to a decidedly impoverished area of research. However, from a methodological perspective the book is, on the whole, disappointing, and fails to attain the quality and originality of the author's earlier contributions to the study of Yoruba art and culture (1974; 1976). The book's methodological and conceptual shortcomings, together with its intrepidly daring theoretical assertions, raise important questions concerning the nature of scholarship in what is inevitably a highly emotional, political, and ideologically charged area of investigation. A critical reading of *Flash of the spirit* leaves this reviewer with serious reservations about both the form and content of the work.

The purpose of the book, the author tells us, is to identify “specifically Yoruba, Kongo[,], Dahomean, Mande, and Ejagham influences on the art and philosophies of black people throughout the Americas” (pp. xiv–xv). In so doing, he proposes to go beyond earlier works, which have “shown [only] generalized African

cultural unities linking the women and men of West and Central Africa to black people in the New World" (p. xiv). While seeking to identify specific cultural traits linking Africa to the Americas, Thompson skillfully skirts a problematic issue characteristic of the brief intellectual history of such research, namely the obvious difficulty of distilling from the multifarious societies of the sub-Saharan continent a single "African" culture. In effect, however, it would seem that the author has simply replaced Herskovits's schema of culture areas (1924) with a more fashionable concept of ethnic groups, thereby departing less radically from the contributions of a half century ago than one would have hoped for in a book that advertises itself in the jacket blurb as a "landmark of scholarship."

Flash of the spirit is comprised of five chapters, each devoted to New World manifestations of a particular African "aesthetic tradition." The first chapter deals with what Thompson refers to as Yoruba traditions in the Old and New World. Relying on his expertise in Yoruba art and culture, the author identifies similarities between the ways in which the Yoruba of West Africa reflect upon and create their art and their social world, and the ways in which certain peoples in the Americas (especially those of African descent in New York City, Miami, Havana, Matanzas, Recife, Bahia, and Rio de Janeiro) conceive of and act upon things in artistic, religious, and social domains. Thompson argues that because art holds a privileged place in Yoruba society, its reaffirmation in the arts of black America is understandable and indeed to be expected. In the author's words:

... sheer artlessness may bring a culture down but a civilization like that of the Yoruba, and the Yoruba-Americans, pulsing with ceaseless creativity richly stabilized by precision and control, will safeguard the passage of its people through the storms of time [p. 97].

Though filled with tremendous appreciation and sympathetic perception for aesthetic continuities between Yoruba art of West Africa and Yoruba-looking art in the Americas, Thompson's analysis is seriously flawed by its failure to identify, or even to broach, the historical (as opposed to metaphysical) links which connect the two artforms in space and time. What he offers is a

highly thought-provoking analysis of the nature of a shared Yoruba ontology stretching across the Atlantic. What he fails to provide is the causative basis for such a connection: the *fait accompli* thus being granted more analytical weight than the processes by which Yoruba art and philosophy were “transplanted” to the New World.

The second chapter, based on one of Thompson’s earlier works (1981), is an investigation of Kongo art and religion in the Americas. Here, Thompson argues that “Kongo civilization and art were not obliterated in the New World: they resurfaced in the coming together, here and there, of numerous slaves from Kongo and Angola” (p. 104). Selecting four Kongo artistic and sacred traditions — the cosmogram, *minkisi* charms, the grave, and bottle trees — Thompson identifies what he perceives to be their New World counterparts.

In this section we are also introduced to James Hampton and Henry Dorsey, two twentieth-century Afro-American artists. Thompson explores these individuals’ artistic creations, focusing primarily on the Kongo traditions which seem to inform them. Again, there is no distinction made between the art and philosophies of Africa which date to the era of the Atlantic slave trade — the material which, according to Thompson’s argument, would have formed part and parcel of the cultural baggage transported by African men and women to the New World — and the art and philosophies of contemporary Africa. He writes, for instance,

Like the spectral pulleys, wheels, and switches on a modern Kongo drum, he [Henry Dorsey] brought together a liquor jug, the blades of an electric fan, and a metal disk to form a material constellation of objects . . . [pp. 147–50].

What links these two forms of aesthetic expression is left unclear to the reader, save perhaps their being joined by the “flash of the spirit” — that visual and philosophic stream of creativity and imagination which somehow traverses the Atlantic owing no allegiance to boundaries of space and time.

Haitian *vodun*, the topic of the third chapter, is described by Thompson as “a vibrant, sophisticated synthesis of the traditional religions of Dahomey, Yorubaland, and Kongo with an infusion

of Roman Catholicism" (p. 163). Here, in a sense, Thompson is more sensitive than elsewhere in the book to what he terms the "reblending," or what Mintz and Price (1976) — using a technical linguistic analogy — have called the "remodelling," of various African and European cultures which were brought together in the New World. Yet, hidden behind this apparent openness to an acceptance of the complexity of cultural heritage there lies a curious insistence on dissecting the product of such synthesis, in this case *vodun*, into its putatively separate, distinct roots. Hence, we find that the chapter is divided into sections labeled "Dahomean Influences on Haitian Sacred Art" and "Kongo Influences on Haitian Sacred Art." Here again, this reviewer finds little or no departure from Herskovits's work on the subject published in the 1930s. This is a pity, for what was seminal scholarship fifty years ago appears today, in light of recent research (e.g., Lowenthal 1978), to be an unwarrantable retention of the errors of less adequate theories.

The final two chapters of the book are related to one another by the attention paid to the arts of adornment. Chapter Five is an exploration of Ejagham influences on the iconography of Afro-Cuban symbolic expression as represented in designs on cloth and clothing. Great attention is given to the Ejagham feathered calabash because the "structure of these plumes is special to the Ejagham, hence unmistakable when they reemerge in Cuba to attain full and lasting value" (p. 236). The penultimate chapter, "Round Houses and Rhythimized Textiles," examines the influence of certain African stylistic traditions in architecture and weaving on specific Afro-American arts in the New World. This chapter deserves detailed analysis, for it poses some of the most serious methodological problems in the book.

Thompson's analysis of Afro-American textiles posits a Mande influence which finds echoes in the rhythms of melodic accents in both African and Afro-American music. His phrasing of the aesthetic principles which inform Mande and so-called Mande-influenced textiles in terms which are suggestive of a musical paradigm is a fascinating and important contribution to our understanding of the aesthetics of narrow-strip cloth. The paradigm, however, fails to help us grasp adequately the continuities which, Thompson argues, stretch across the Atlantic.

Here, as elsewhere, Thompson suggests that Afro-Americans recaptured in their art the "flavor of the [African] past" which was trampled by the experience of slavery, and physically altered by a new environment (in this case the loss of the narrow-band loom). The crux of his argument centers on the resemblance of Mande "country cloths" (narrow-strip textiles sewn together in such a way as to form a pattern characterized by the juxtaposition of different colored strips) and textiles produced by the Saramaka and Djuka Maroons of Suriname (cloths made by sewing together strips of multicolored commercially-made fabrics). Thompson insists that Suriname textiles are Mande-influenced expressions of a deeply-rooted African past.

Though relying extensively, for his information about Mande textiles, on what is surely one of the finest works written on the subject (Lamb 1975), Thompson completely disregards, for his information on Suriname textiles, the work of Sally and Richard Price (1980) which, like Lamb's study, is based on extensive fieldwork and historical research. This is clearly a sin of omission, but almost certainly not an involuntary oversight; for the Prices' findings plainly contradict Thompson's theory of Africanisms directly transplanted to the New World, and the inclusion of their material would surely weaken his argument, pointing instead toward a more nuanced approach to Afro-American art history. The Prices introduce their detailed discussion by noting that

Maroon narrow-strip textiles . . . are strikingly similar to woven narrow-strip cloths from West Africa . . . Once we realize, however, that Maroon narrow-strip sewing began only during this century, it becomes clear that this art could not have been passed down, generation by generation, from African origins, and we are forced to consider other — more subtle and less readily documentable — processes of historical influence [1980: 72-73].

Thompson, choosing not even to cite the Prices' historical research, suggests instead:

Variables of Mande and Mande-related cloth-making remain indelibly intact in these Mande, West African-influenced regions of the New World. The recombination of these variables to form novel creole art — also embodying European influences — is an autonomous development in the history of Afro-American visual creativity, especially in Suriname. *Nevertheless*, the vibrant visual attack and timing of these cloths are unthinkable except in terms of

partial descent from Mande cloth, a world of metrically sparkling textiles [p. 208; emphasis mine].

A critical reading of Thompson's book raises serious issues for students of Afro-American art and culture. What is at stake here is not merely a pedantic argument over the "true" provenance of Afro-American artistic styles and sources of inspiration. What is being called into question is a more fundamental problem, namely the nature and the use of evidence in art historical and anthropological research in areas of African and Afro-American art. For indeed, the shortcomings in Thompson's work force us to consider whether it is sufficient or even acceptable to employ a methodology in which theory determines the use of evidence rather than one in which each informs the other. Is it sufficient merely to extrapolate evidence backwards in time, assuming that similarities in the present are, perforce, echoes of the past? Or, rather, is it more reasonable to proceed slowly from the evidence of the past to the conditions of the present?

To be sure, each approach has its drawback. Whereas the former risks painting a history of Afro-American art with brushstrokes far too bold, the latter runs the chance of drawing a portrait so unfinished and incomplete that its image may not immediately be recognizable. However, in the final analysis, the second approach, though perhaps more painstaking, provides us with the empirical knowledge necessary to understand Afro-American art in ways far more profound. By avoiding the presumption of positioning the art along an unbroken arc of metaphysical continuities, the approach seeks to uncover the art's place and meaning in an historical context, thereby posing more directly questions concerning what it is that makes it culturally distinct and, as it were, Afro-American in the fullest sense of the word.

What Thompson has offered us in *Flash of the spirit* is a celebration of Afro-American arts — a celebration which, for all its genuine sensitivity and excitement, approaches the notion of historical evidence in a strictly impressionistic way. One can only hope that future works, inspired by the sense of dignity and animation with which Thompson imbues the arts of black America, take more seriously the schism between intuitive feeling

and historical knowing, thereby embarking on a rational, objective study of Afro-American art which seeks to reconcile what E. H. Gombrich (1979) appropriately called "the demands of the heart with those of the head."

REFERENCES

GOMBRICH, E. H., 1979. *Ideals and idols: essays on value in history and in art*. Oxford, Phaidon Press.

HERSKOVITS, MELVILLE J., 1924. A preliminary consideration of the culture areas of Africa. *American Anthropologist* 26(1): 50-63.

LAMB, VENICE, 1975. *West African weaving*. London, Duckworth.

LOWENTHAL, IRA P., 1978. Ritual performance and religious experience: a service for the gods in southern Haiti. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 34(3): 392-414.

MINTZ, SIDNEY W. & RICHARD PRICE, 1976. *An anthropological approach to the Afro-American past: a Caribbean perspective*. Philadelphia, Institute for the Study of Human Issues.

PRICE, SALLY & RICHARD PRICE, 1980. *Afro-American arts of the Suriname rain forest*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

THOMPSON, ROBERT FARRIS, 1974. *African art in motion*. Los Angeles, University of California Press.

—, 1976. *Black gods and kings*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

— & JOSEPH CORNET, 1981. *The four moments of the sun: Kongo art in two worlds*. Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.

CHRISTOPHER B. STEINER
Department of Anthropology
Harvard University
Cambridge MA 02138, U.S.A.

Atlantic empires: the network of trade and revolution, 1713-1826.

PEGGY K. LISS. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, Johns Hopkins Studies in Atlantic History and Culture, 1983. xxiii + 348 pp. (Cloth US\$ 29.50)

History monographs are not any longer what they used to be. The majority of the learned additions to the field are stuffed with tables, graphs, diagrams, and even "scattergrams" or by other such new gadgets as invented by the home computer industry. I hasten to add here however, that the quantitative approach to history often has led to new and valuable interpretations, which the narrative historian has been unable to provide. In short, the writing of history needs both the quantifier and narrator.

It certainly is not difficult to exclude the author of *Atlantic empires* from the quantitative category. Her book does not contain a single graph, diagram, or table. On the other hand, the book does not really tell a story; it just rambles on without a thesis or concept, but with endless lists of names mixed with information on religion, economic thinking, and intellectual history. Also, the author has done her homework and read an impressive list of books, as the extensive set of footnotes indicates. Unfortunately, the reader is unsparingly made aware of the author's hard work by endless quotes from both contemporary works and present-day monographs.

Yet, the actual focus of the book is well chosen: the commercial networks of the eighteenth-century Atlantic region have not been the object of many historical works. In fact, the most recent survey of eighteenth-century America by Max Savelle (1974) needed a shorter, more conceptual, and less encyclopaedic companion. *Atlantic empires* does not fill this gap. The title of the book promises too much: it does not really deal with the commercial connections in the North Atlantic and no mention at all is made of the changing position of West Africa within the Atlantic trading network. The book concentrates on the Iberian peninsula and its colonial empire in South America.

Admittedly, the author made a good choice, because the trading connections between North America, the Caribbean, West Africa, and Europe have been extensively studied. To my knowledge there are very few studies in English, which focus on the Southern Atlantic during the eighteenth century. Because of this, chapters 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 all contain valuable information on Spain, Portugal, Spanish America, and Brazil. In these chapters the author discusses the ideology regarding "empire" in the two

mother countries as well as the impact of the U.S. War of Independence on the intellectual life in Latin America and on its perception of the colonial link with Spain and Portugal. In the other chapters the author tries to describe similar developments in England and North America. In so doing she only confuses the reader, and she fails to take into account that both North and South America could hardly be viewed as just two different regions. Within each subcontinent there were innumerable differences and the book should have confined itself to an analysis of the different areas within Latin America.

In spite of all the information the author provides, she fails to document some major developments. She is unable to explain why the population of the plantation areas in Latin America reacted differently towards the movement for colonial independence from the inhabitants of the settlement areas. Why did the Spanish Caribbean remain Spanish for much of the subsequent nineteenth century, while parts of Argentina and Venezuela had already rebelled long before Simon Bolivar appeared on the scene?

In discussing the Spanish Caribbean, the author mentions the upsurge in sugar production during the period of British occupation in the Seven Years' War. The slave imports even tripled. She does not explain which factors inhibited the growth of Cuban plantation agriculture under Spanish domination. Why were the Cuban planters so keen on restoring Spanish rule? Or, alternatively, why were the British at all willing to hand Cuba back to Spain?

In her last chapter (10), the author tries to make up for the conceptual deficiencies in the previous part of the book. In her epilogue she makes some comparative observations regarding the effect of the newly acquired independence of North and South America. It is, indeed, striking to see how the economic growth of the U.S. after independence more than matched that of Western Europe, while the socio-economic development of Latin America only created isolated areas of growth within that continent. After posing this very interesting question, however, Liss fails to give an answer and instead confronts the reader with an impressive number of citations from scholars, which belong to the socio-

historical "dependencia" school, now headed by Immanuel Wallerstein. In another of her observations, she comes back to this important question by arguing that the economy of the U.S. could develop towards an industrial "take-off," while Latin America was inhibited in taking a similar course, because England needed an outlet for the products of its own Industrial Revolution. Again, this observation is no answer to the question of why the incorporation of North and South America in the "world economy" had such different consequences for the two sub-continent concerned. If the author really had addressed herself to this question, she would have realized that the formal similarity between the acquisition of independence in North and South America obscured the vital socio-economic differences which existed between these two areas. Actually, long before independence the involvement of Latin America in the Atlantic trading network had produced structural underdevelopment in many regions, while from the outset the participation of North America in the Atlantic commerce had had an opposite effect. It is obvious that in order to cope properly with her own "observations" the author should have written another book.

REFERENCE

SAVELLE, MAX, 1974. *Empires to nations; expansion in America, 1713-1824*. Minneapolis and London; University of Minnesota Press and Oxford University Press.

P. C. EMMER
Centre for the History of European Expansion
University of Leiden
2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

After Africa: extracts from British travel accounts . . . in the British West Indies. ROGER D. ABRAHAMS and JOHN F. SZWED (eds.). New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983. 444 pp. (Paper US\$ 12.95)

In a competent and intelligent introductory essay (which non-

etheless appears to have been essentially written a number of years ago and which could have profited from more recent scholarship), the editors address such issues as the cultural implications of African and European interactions, the creation of Afro-American cultures, and the cultural legacy of Africa in the New World. Approaching such issues from a fundamentally Herskovitsian perspective, the editors argue against the "deculturation model" of the slave, stress the tenacity of African-derived cultural features in the New World, and discuss how the African past is manifest in Afro-American life, particularly in "expressive culture," including funerals, music and dance, folktales, religion and magic, and "eloquence traditions." The "expressive continuities," as they survived and were reinterpreted in slavery, are "crucial to an understanding of the institutions developed by blacks in their various New World situations" (p. 9), and "contemporary studies of black peoples" which lack "a historical or comparative perspective . . . are misleading or at least painfully one-dimensional" (p. 47).

An historical ethnographic perspective on slaves can be derived from European narratives, and this book is largely composed of extracts (varying in length and informational value) from published seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century planter and traveller descriptions of slave (and postemancipation black folk) life in the British West Indies; most accounts, especially the ones most frequently extracted, are well known to students of British West Indian sociocultural history. The extracts focus on "expressive culture" and are presented in topically organized chapters (e.g., "ways of speaking," anancy tales, religion and magic, festivals and holidays, music and dance), most of which are briefly, and sometimes superficially, introduced by the editors.

A lengthy appendix provides "a sampler of accounts" of U.S. slaves (all of which relate to the very late U.S. slave period), but the rationale for its inclusion (p. 47) is weak, and its comparative value for elucidating British West Indian slave life is ambiguous.

The concluding section, "biographical notes on authors reprinted," is inadequate. Not only is information lacking on anonymously authored works (thus sometimes leaving unclear the time period and territory referred to), but also about seventeen of the

fifty-six named authors on the West Indies lack "biographical notes." Notes for the remainder are usually minimally informative, and assist little in evaluating the individual authors, the nature and context of their observations, even sometimes identifying the territory and time period they are discussing. Other (non-extracted) published works by the same authors are also listed; since most of these have no bearing on the West Indies or slavery, it is unclear why they are included.

"The task of our book," the editors write, is "to seek out in the oldest documents available the encounter of Africans and Europeans in the New World, toward the discovery of what was and is distinctly Afro-American in the cultures of the Americas" (p. 2). However, by including only the British West Indies and published narrative accounts in English this book does not deal with the "oldest documents available." Given the editors' general interests, it is unclear why they confine themselves geographically, or even omit non-English and manuscript accounts of the British West Indies. Moreover, the main sources utilized, despite their ethnographic richness, can implicitly convey a distorted geographic and temporal image of British West Indian slave life.

Although published accounts of Jamaican slaves (and post-emancipation black folk) are relatively copious, about 61% of the British West Indian extract pages deal with Jamaica and, without guidance from the editors, can give the misleading impression that the cultural practices of Jamaican slaves (and ex-slaves) are fully representative of the rest of the West Indies. Suriname/British Guiana receive a little over 15% of the pages, Barbados 8%, and the British Virgins close to 5%. The remaining 11% are unequally spread among Antigua, the Bahamas, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, St. Kitts, Grenada, and Trinidad.

The extracts presented can also create an impression that slave behavior and beliefs showed no significant changes over a long period and that, for example, an early eighteenth-century description adequately conveys what existed a century later; or that observations in the 1880s and 1890s are applicable to the slave period (or its later phases?). Although the extracts extend from the mid-1600s to the 1890s, roughly 6% treat the seventeenth century and early decades of the eighteenth; about 20% cover the last

quarter or so of the eighteenth century, and about 35% the preemancipation decades of the nineteenth century. Thus, while about 61% of the extract pages treat the slave period per se, many reflect the last stages of that period (when important changes were occurring in slave sociocultural life) and a significant number of pages deal with postemancipation times (about 30% from the 1850s through the 1890s). Although many cultural features of free black folk emerged during slavery, the form these features assumed over time and the identification of which ones emerged or crystallized after slavery remain to be established. The editors do not explain why they include post-slavery accounts or how such accounts elucidate the behaviors and beliefs of slaves.

The book's intended audience is not explicitly defined, but it is clearly for a student audience new to the subject matter. Yet the book can create a misleading geographic, temporal, and ethnographic picture of West Indian slave life and encourage a narrow view that narrative published accounts by planters and travellers are the only types of sources or data base available for reconstructing that life. Moreover, although the editors attempt to locate the accounts in general in a wider cultural context so as to help the reader understand the Euro-centric perspectives represented, the reader is nonetheless often expected to accept individual accounts at face value. The accounts, however, can be misleading in their reportage and interpretations of slave behavior and belief. Thus, the reader should have some guidance (external to this book) in approaching the accounts and in exploring the methodological problems of researching slave life in order to appreciate more fully the wider issues addressed by the editors in their introduction.

JEROME S. HANDLER
Department of Anthropology
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale IL 62901, U.S.A.

Strike the iron: a colony at war: Jamaica, 1939-1945. KEN POST. 2 volumes. Atlantic Highlands NJ: Humanities Press, 1981. xiv + 567 pp. (Cloth US\$ 40.00)

In 1978 Ken Post published his first study of the development of the Jamaican labor movement, *Arise Ye Starvelings*. It focused on the disturbances of 1937–38 which profoundly affected the history of the island. This two-volume sequel takes the record up to the closing phases of the Second World War and the beginning of major political reform: the new constitution of 1944 which introduced universal adult suffrage. These three volumes are, without any doubt, the finest examinations of this crucial period of Jamaican history. They are characterized by meticulous research, insightful analysis, and a sharp, overtly-stated Marxist orientation which, fortunately, never allows ideology to obscure the confusing complexity of the political reality of Jamaica during the war years.

No one has described with greater detail the bewildering difficulties of that period. The agriculture — mainly based on the production of sugar and bananas — was in trouble. The political system, under an authoritarian, ambitious, and egotistical governor, was in trouble. The imperial system was undergoing economic strains even before the Second World War exposed its untenable fragility. And the social structure of Jamaica was reconstituting itself, as the old planter class of expatriate Europeans and psychological transients lost their basis for wealth, lost their stamina for life in the tropics, lost their influence in the English Parliamentary system, and were in danger of losing their hold on the administrative machinery of the colony. For the ancien regime, then, it was the worst of times. Yet, for the aspiring classes it looked like the best of times. Jamaican nationalism was being born. Posterity, however, will record another chapter in the catalogue of missed opportunities, shifting alliances, vicious political squabbling, and administrative inadequacy which characterized the passage from colonialism.

Basing his research on documentation in the British Public Record Office, the National Archives of the United States, the West India Reference Library of the Institute of Jamaica, and the collection of papers left by Richard Hart documenting the formative years of the Peoples National Party, Post set himself — and accomplished with remarkable success — five tasks:

the evolution of British policy towards Jamaica under pressure of war; the penetration by United States capitalism under cover of wartime conditions; the development of the labour movement in the colony, with special reference to the role of its avowed Communists; the continuing importance of Black Nationalism as a theme of resistance to colonial capitalism; and the role of critics of that phenomenon in the United Kingdom itself [p. vii].

Each of these is magisterially examined. Post explores the different class appeals and contradictions not only of the cousins, Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante, but also of the political techniques and appeals of their rival parties for the initial elections of 1944. He demonstrates the internal conflicts, contradictions and problems of the Peoples National Party which not only elucidate the causes for their electoral problems in the 1940s and 1950s, but also presage the problems that would return to haunt the party in the 1970s. Post clearly demonstrates that ideology represented only one aspect of political party formation in Jamaica. In those years, the "class rhythms" failed to harmonize themselves with national self-consciousness, economic development, and intellectual articulation. For the political actors of trades unions, imperial bureaucracy (at the local or central level), the United States, as well as the fledgling parties, the conflicting demands of religion, race, nationalism, and class consciousness (for the various sectors) created some complex situations, which they could not control and which they dimly understood.

Post covers some of the same ground of some other works dealing with the rise of organized trades unionism and party politics in Jamaica, for example, Trevor Munroe's, *The politics of constitutional decolonization*, George Eaton's, *Alexander Bustamante and modern Jamaica*, and two books by United States representative, Paul Blanshard — *Democracy and empire in the Caribbean*, and his autobiography, *Personal and controversial*. None of these, however, is as richly detailed or as thoroughly analytical as *Strike the iron*. No one who attempts to understand Jamaican labor and political development and West Indian history can avoid reading this delightful and thoroughly rewarding book. Here the issues, the personalities, and the complicated ways in which they resolved themselves — or were postponed — come to light with a shar-

pened poignancy which evokes the thought that the more things change in Jamaican politics, the more they remain the same.

FRANKLIN W. KNIGHT
Department of History
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore MD 21218, U.S.A.

Anti-slavery, religion and reform: essays in memory of Roger Anstey.

CHRISTINE BOLT and SEYMOUR DRESCHER (eds.). Folkstone, Kent, England: William Dawson and Sons; Hampden CT: Archon Books, 1980. xii + 377 pp. (Cloth U.S.\$ 27.50)

Roger Anstey was a scholar whose combination of industry, integrity, and open-mindedness made him, in David Brion Davis' words (in the preface to this volume) a nerve centre of international and comparative scholarship on slavery issues. The papers now published from the conference he organized at the Bellagio Centre, Italy in 1978, a few months before his sudden and untimely death, are a tribute to the role he played. The volume charts work in progress, main currents, promising eddies, and areas unknown; contributions are drawn from Britain, the United States, France, and Holland, a North Atlantic provenance leaving Spain, Portugal, and Latin America open for new initiatives.

The main current proves to be, still, the investigation of abolitionist ideology (or its absence) and its political impact. C. Duncan Rice examines anti-slavery ideology as reflected in contemporary literature; Howard Temperley discusses it as cultural imperialism; Christine Bolt explores it in terms of its effect on work among American Indians; Wyatt-Brown considers its connections with missionary work; and Brion Davis' end-piece re-affirms that "the impetus behind British anti-slavery policies were mainly religious" (p. 364).

Equal attention, however, is given to the processes that refracted religious convictions into political action, a process which, as Anstey's own article adumbrates, had made abolitionist convictions part of the "official mind" of imperial England by the mid-nineteenth century. Ditchfield elaborates the underlying conver-

gence of abolition, parliamentary reform, and repeal (i.e., of the Test and Corporation acts) in terms of the numbers of M.P.'s willing to support them. Abolition survived the impact of the French Revolution best because it was the most broadly based in parliament and the country (p. 114).

What is most significant here is that the abolitionists, from the outset of their struggle, are part of a broadly based thrust toward major reforms — a thrust which in Harrison's analysis generated the Liberal Party (p. 119). It was this broad base which allowed the generation, at crucial moments, of the unprecedented levels of extra-parliamentary support for abolition described by Walvin, ensured British abolitionist influence among French protestants as outlined by Drescher (p. 53), and gave weight to British abolitionist efforts to protect fugitive American slaves who sought freedom in Canada, an issue investigated in Turbey's contribution (p. 163).

The class basis and political content of this "popular" support is now under investigation on both sides of the Atlantic. Hollis makes clear that, in the analysis of radical working class leaders, chattel slavery left the people better provided for than proletarian wage slavery; they saw emancipation as "a species of moral humbug" and the road to more intensive exploitation for blacks and whites (p. 302). The analysis of the radical leaders, however, does not preclude the possibility that, at a popular level, both factory and farm workers supported abolition, as Cobbett himself was moved to do, in the final reform elections. Walvin remarks that from the mid-1820s reform petitions were "steeped in the vernacular of what had once been artisan radicalism" (p. 155). The radicals' labour-oriented critique of slavery became, perhaps, more compelling propaganda in the hands of the Chartists after slave emancipation had taken place as it did, Foner argues, in the United States after the Civil War (p. 269).

These mainstream papers are placed in a new context by accompanying studies which begin the process, long overdue, of comparison between the Anglo-American and continental abolitionism. Drescher's detailed exercise throws into relief the uniquely religious and popular formation of the Anglo-American model and Daget concludes that religious sentiment played "a

very feeble part" in the French struggle (p. 76), which was influenced rather by the Institut D'Afrique's concern with an economically appropriate basis for African colonization. This sharp difference does not relate, as Drescher establishes, to Catholic and Protestant divisions; Denmark, Sweden, and predominantly Protestant Holland are continental cases (p. 45). Dutch emancipation eventually took place in 1863 only after prolonged debate which, Emmer suggests, reflected a society where politicians, elected by 10% of the highest taxed male population, and investors in industrial and colonial firms worked hand in hand (p. 94) — when, in fact, it was judged appropriate to Holland's balance of trade.

The continental contrast makes it clear that Anglo-American studies of abolition must, ultimately, encompass the economic substructure of those events. One of the most interesting papers veers in this direction. Eltis and Engerman point to the divorce Eric Williams has been allowed to institute between morality and economics — a divorce which would have puzzled the abolitionists themselves (p. 261). Williams' critics have provided a better context for reviewing the relationship between anti-slavery and industrial capitalism, but have left the specifics in doubt. Eltis and Engerman address the specific ideological assumption that free labour was more productive than slave labour and suggest that the mid-nineteenth-century Foreign Office was automatically abolitionist because free labor, along with free trade, were the foundations of British civilization and best for the rest of the world. The abolitionists emerge, momentarily, as servants of industrial capital and its flood of manufactures. A conference to discuss "where do ideologies come from?" may soon be on the agenda.

MARY TURNER
Department of History
Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3H 3J5

Slaves and missionaries: the disintegration of Jamaican slave society, 1787-1834. MARY TURNER. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982. 223 pp. (Cloth US\$ 25.95)

It has never been easy to persuade young students of West Indian history at the University of the West Indies that the influence of the Dissenting missionaries on the slaves before emancipation was anything but patently conservative. Did not their parent societies in the metropole insistently warn them off politics? Did the missionaries not emphasize in their preaching that servants/slaves must obey their masters? Did not the missionaries support the status quo in order to gain the tolerance of planter patrons? What was the so-called neutrality on the question of slavery if not support for the slave masters? Did the missionaries not dissuade the slaves from rebellion and repudiate any part in the great 1831 slave rebellion in Jamaica? That slave rebellion happened in spite of the missionaries, not because of them. Some missionaries did become open abolitionists after 1832, but these were the refugee missionaries in England rather than those remaining in Jamaica; and at any rate, two years of support for abolition can hardly exonerate fifty years of support for the slave system. This point of view has always coexisted with two facts that apparently contradict it: planters generally took the missionaries as enemies of slavery; and slaves generally took them as friends of abolition. Could so many slaves have been mistaken? How could experienced and embattled planters not have known their enemies?

The assessment of the role of the Dissenting missionaries before emancipation is inherently more problematic than an evaluation of what they did after emancipation. This book by Mary Turner is the most valuable contribution to the discussion in relation to Jamaica. Turner has uncompromisingly developed the view that the influence of the Dissenting missionaries was a solvent on the master/slave relationship, undermining the slave system not by attacking it directly, but by indirectly preparing the slaves to attack it themselves. She recognizes a degree of ambivalence in the situation of the missionaries before 1831, but she has no doubts that greater weight should be attached to their contribution to the intellectual and political development of some slaves than to their sermons of submission to slavery. Turner's thesis is that the mission chapels gave slave converts a new status based on merit independent of the plantation hierarchy; provided opportunities for the development of leadership capacity; enhanced the con-

verts' self esteem and sense of equality with free persons; gave them a new right (religious freedom) to fight for; and provided some with the precious tools of literacy. In all these ways the missionaries developed the moral and intellectual capacities of the slaves. The Baptist mission allowed the Native Baptists to spread and shelter under their protective neglect. Slave support for the mission churches and the Native Baptists became almost a form of slave resistance. In making this case, Turner has been painstaking, thoughtful, and competent. Turner acknowledges that it was the slaves themselves who politicized the Christian message, not the missionaries. It was the slaves themselves who made their own struggle for freedom under their own slave leaders. The Baptist war, Turner knows, might more correctly have been called the Native Baptist war. Perhaps the extent to which missionary influence was a decisive factor in slave resistance can only be gauged after a general inquiry into the nature and causes of slave resistance in Jamaica, which is not done in this book.

But even then there would be problems in establishing the nature of the connection between missions and slave resistance. The evidence is generally too soft in the belly, too dependent on inference. If Turner's thesis cannot be thoroughly disproved, it can hardly be proved beyond doubt either. There is an insuperable element of incalculability in the transmission of values from teacher to pupil, from European to creole/African, from Christian to heathen, from missionary to slave, which makes it very difficult to convince beyond doubt that Burchell (or his chapel) caused Sam Sharpe to rebel. Perhaps Turner might feel that her thesis about the subversive effects of missionary activity on the slave system does not need a major slave rebellion as proof; but readers might very well think differently or must begin to believe that missionary activity everywhere in the West Indies, even in Antigua, was ipso facto disruptive of the slave system. For the missionaries apparently went about their pre-emancipation enterprise in pretty much the same fashion everywhere. In some recent analyses of slave resistance, scholars have been objecting to explanations that are Euro-centered; and Turner seems to be providing an explanation that is more Euro-centered than slave-centered. Still, this might simply mean no more than that she is

writing more about missionaries than slaves. And she is writing more about free-lancing small town Methodist and Baptist missionaries than about patron-protected, estate-bound Presbyterian and Moravian missionaries; it is not easy to erase the image of those quiet Moravians in St. Elizabeth and Manchester as conservers, not breakers, of the slave system; and Turner has not made them an exception to her conclusions.

In writing *Slaves and missionaries*, Turner has single-mindedly pursued her thesis without stopping to look to the right or to the left at controversies along the way. Readers who expect a contribution to the debate on the relationship between the 1831 slave rebellion and the abolition of slavery will be disappointed. Elsewhere Turner has suggested that this rebellion helped to convince the metropolitan abolitionists that immediate abolition was the best solution; this perhaps represents a more recent position. Turner could reasonably answer, however, that in the book she is interested in what missionaries, not slaves, did for the abolition of slavery. Still, Sam Sharpe, as the supreme missionary product, certainly deserves more serious attention.

Dr. Turner has made exhaustive use of the missionary records. She has obviously had to face the unhappy consequences of the destruction of some of the Baptist materials in the Second World War. The evidence from the Methodist missionaries predominates in the pre-1831 era. Readers might justifiably have expected a "Methodist War" by Chapter 6, rather than a Baptist war. We have grown accustomed, perhaps without enough evidence, to thinking of the Baptist missionaries as the most active group both before and after emancipation.

CARL. C. CAMPBELL
Department of History
University of the West Indies
Mona, Kingston, Jamaica

Public finance and economic development: spotlight on Jamaica. HUGH N. DAWES. Washington D.C.: University Press of America, 1982. xvi + 147 pp. (Cloth US\$ 21.25, Paper US\$ 10.00)

This book starts with the assumption that capital investment is the primary engine of growth and sets out to show how the public sector in Jamaica may influence the rate of capital formation by carrying out policies that will affect the rate of savings. The logic of the author's argument follows closely that of the Harrod-Domar economic growth model in which capital is the only growth-determining agent. In fact, it is the extension of this model by Richard A. Musgrave (1959) to include the government sector which forms the basis of Dawes' analysis.

The core of the book is a 46-equation econometric model which is described in Chapter 2. In Chapters 3, 4, and 5, the author discusses his statistical estimation of the various sectors of the model, but his main aim is to estimate the rates of private and public saving since these are considered crucial for capital formation. In Chapter 6, he provides a verification of his model by comparing his projected estimates of the variables with their observed values for 1959-1974 and for 1958 and 1975, and concludes that "the predicted values are . . . significantly close to the observed values" and that "the model behaves sufficiently well to render its use as an extrapolation device for a longer period of time" (p. 86).

Yet Dawes recognizes the futility of this exercise: "The real problem . . . is that these types of models . . . reflect the structure of the economy for a past period, [so that] if the structure changes significantly, so too will . . . the values of the predicated variables" (pp. 114-15).

In Jamaica, as in other non-oil-producing developing countries, the oil price shocks of the 1970s had a profound effect on the course of economic development. When we add to this massive expansion of government consumption by the Michael Manley government, the drying up of foreign direct investment, and the growing burden of the public debt, we are left with a picture of an economy drastically different from that frozen in data that are ten years old.

Dawes' estimates show that the personal savings rate in Jamaica during the 1959-1974 period was negative; he attributes this partly to the growth of consumer credit and partly to the demonstration effect of North American consumption levels on

domestic consumption. His prescription for increasing the savings ratio, and hence the rate of growth of gross domestic product, is to reduce domestic consumption with higher taxes. In a society in which a substantial share of the population lives at subsistence level, the burden of additional across-the-board taxes would reduce the standard of living. The simplistic quality of his policy prescription arises directly from the simplistic nature of the growth model on which his analysis is based. A serious limitation of this model, as far as its application to a developing country is concerned, lies in its assumption that in equilibrium there is full employment and price stability. In the Jamaican context, for the period examined by Dawes, no such conditions prevailed. And no such conditions have appeared since. The fact is that the unemployment rate has been hovering around twenty-five percent over the past decade and the rate of inflation for that period has exceeded the highest in the developed countries.

Properly specified econometric models are more useful for making short term predictions, since drastic structural changes do not normally occur in the short term. The developments of the past decade clearly underscore the risk of making long term predictions. The upshot is that the importance of this book is reduced to that of a mere historical artifact.

REFERENCE

MUSGRAVE, RICHARD A., 1959. *The theory of public finance*. New York, McGraw-Hill.

RANSFORD W. PALMER
Department of Economics
Howard University
Washington D.C. 20059, U.S.A.

Guyana gold: the story of Wellesley A. Baird, Guyana's greatest miner.
WELLESLEY A. BAIRD, with an end essay by KATHLEEN J. ADAMS.
Washington D.C.: Three Continents Press, 1982. 185 pp. (Cloth US\$ 16.00, Paper US\$ 7.00)

It may be of some use to compare this autobiographical work by a

Guyanese gold miner with another celebrated example of a Caribbean life story, taken from the anthropological literature. By considering *Guyana gold* alongside Sidney Mintz's *Worker in the cane* (1960), we can gain an immediate understanding of what it is *not*. *Worker in the cane* marks an innovation in the history of American anthropology, for in it, probably for the first time, speech is given to those whom Mintz calls "the ordinary people." Through the unfolding of a particular life history, we gain insights into the socio-economic and ideological complexity of Puerto Rican society. But what makes this enterprise especially effective is the privileged relation between the informant, Taso, and the anthropologist, who is the actual agent responsible for the final shape of the narrative. In counterpoint to the story itself, analyses and interpretations are put forth, which raise the significance of the anecdotes to a more general level. Mintz in a sense intrudes into the web of Taso's discourse in order to be able to identify with him, while at the same time making explicit the conditions surrounding the gathering of information and the forming of interpretations. The work of Wellesley Baird cannot be placed in this same line, in spite of its shared autobiographical character, for the author is himself the narrator. Baird addresses himself, then, directly to the reader, without passing his account through the filter of another's interpretation.

In dedicating his book to his fellow miners of the Guyanese forest, he addresses himself also to all those to whom the penetrating of frontiers matters. We the readers, likewise, are given the task of "penetrating" his narrative, following his meandering movements, and the difficulties that marked his life as a gold-seeker in the interior of British Guiana between 1932 and 1969. The role of the anthropologist here was one of mediating for this edition of the work: "I am wondering if I would be asking too much of you as regards helping to put my biography in shape if I send you a rough draft" (p. 176). Beyond this, Kathleen J. Adams provides us, in a well-documented and illuminating essay following Baird's story ("God, Utopia, and Guyana"), with some elements of analysis and some interpretations. Adams' treatment resituates the adventures and the particular testimony of Baird in a wider context involving a meeting between two modes of life: on the one hand,

that of the Carib Indians, centered essentially on the maintenance of a cultural fund and on the problem of survival; and on the other hand, that of the Afro-Americans who pursue a quest which, guided by the quest for gold, involves the realization in the New World of the ancient European concept of utopia.

One might well regret the division of a book of limited range into three rather different sections (narrative, technical notes, and interpretation). Moreover, a combination of the ensemble according to a more flexible scheme would have permitted us to appreciate better the originality of the enterprise. It is to be regretted that there is not more coherence between the two principal texts; both deserve to be illuminated by one another better and more reciprocally.

In this connection, one notices as well the corpus of illustrations that accompany the different texts. Those that appear in the account of Baird are strongly moving and constitute important visual documents. For its part, Adams' essay is accompanied by photographs of Carib works of art whose atemporal quality is surprising. These two types of illustrations permit us to measure the difference in tonality between a narrative development for which illustration is corollary and an interpretive discourse whose corollary is above all stylistic.

It would not be useful to summarize the various stages that mark out the itinerary of Baird and which lead him along several routes — from the coast into the interior of the country, but also, ineluctably, from adolescence to manhood. We will single out, however, three particular points from this narrative: the initiation into the universe of the forest, the possession of a territory, and the glance at "the other."

The true encounter with the woods is not realized by Baird until after he has had the anguishing experience of being lost there. This entrance into the forest in the first pages of the account procures for the author the opportunity to measure his fantasies against the reality of a virgin land. Wanting to make the journey between two locations 34 miles apart, and becoming lost en route, he feels, successively, physical pain, abandonment, the feeling of dispossession of self, and fear — all things previously imagined but not yet felt in their dramatic reality. When he finally arrives at

"civilization," he has intimately trained his solitude, to be confronted by the abandonment of the landscapes of his own interior.

From the time of his trial, which we would describe as "initiatory," it appears to him easy to clear a territory, such a space having already been conquered within himself as well as within the surrounding forest. He in fact appropriates a territory for the constant search for the gold that it conceals. He knows how to establish landmarks there, to invent techniques, and to note down points of reference, drawing resources for survival, whether from within himself or from the forest. The district of Barama (in the northwest of what was then British Guiana) becomes in a way his own area of sojourn and of diverse investigations. The relations woven between "partners" (fellow miners) — the temporary as well as permanent inhabitants — permit him a familiarity with places and allow him to mark this description of a pioneer mode of life with a detailed observation of natural elements: the flooding of rivers, the animals, the woods. If he obviously speaks of his gold yields, one feels yet that these are not intimately involved with his fundamental preoccupations, and this is rather paradoxical. These latter have as their essential focus the relations with the Carib, the possible exchanges, the distances that it was important not to infringe. What is of importance for us, then, is the view that he carries of these.

This is initially and above all amorous, in the most general sense of the word. Even if his intrusion into the woods has transformed their way of life and the system of exchanges, Baird clearly does not regard the Carib with an anthropological eye. This is not so much owing to a lack of desire to participate and blend himself intimately into the everyday life of these populations that preceded him into this territory; he is obliged to share their daily life, through the game of exchanges and looks, and a form of cohabitation is established which is accompanied also by an involvement in work. But what matters to him even more is the amorous adventure. In this sense, the tenor of the account is strongly evocative. For example, beginning with an exceedingly sensible but still distanced observation — "how can one make love in a hammock?" — there unroll in his head and in his text a series of questions which lead to the following obvious conclusion: it is a

Carib woman who will give birth to his eldest son. He involves himself right away in the relationship, implicates himself in it, and yet it is of little importance to him in fact — as an individual — to question himself about what is to become of a people with whom he shares the same territory.

Another thing this book demonstrates is the profound cultural unity of the Guianas. In the forest of French Guiana, where I have been studying Creole gold prospectors (*orpailleurs*) for the past two years, for example, there still live a few gold prospectors, in contact with other Carib Indians, with the Wayana, and also with the Aluku (Boni) Maroons. It is certain that Baird's narrative would appear profoundly familiar to them. Certain of these Creoles of Antillean origin would spontaneously feel themselves to be "partners" of Baird. They have cut their way into the same spaces, are confronted by the same difficulties of adaptation, and share the same hopes. The working of gold itself, its varying techniques, and the thorny question of exchanges with the autochthonous or immigrant populations are superimposable aspects. Even in the most peculiar little details, one can pick out revealing correspondences. Like the miners of Guyana, those of French Guiana use condensed milk cans to measure their gold yields and, like Baird, some of them employ a wooden stick to extract the cartridges from their old shotguns!

In the two Guianas, one likewise notices that in spite of a familiarity between the different populations, a relative lack of communicativeness is maintained. This in fact permits the respecting of the boundaries of coexistence between the diverse communities. This distance appears to us to be the gauge of the reciprocal existence of each culture, since each finds for itself its own subsistence fund, the resources necessary for its renewal and its dynamism. They are not unaware of each other, being obliged to make exchanges, but there still persists between them a certain impermeability.

This distance between cultures likewise poses the problem of the place of the anthropologist's discourse. Can such a discourse in itself make explicit the diversity of ways of life? Is there not always quietly concealed underneath it his famous notion of utopia — the utopia of being in possession of knowledge of the other? But if the

stranger, by his very presence, enjoys the prestige of novelty and embodies the chance of widening social ties — it was so for Baird in relation to the Caribs and vice versa — then what else are we, if not the attentive witnesses of exchanges that we only rarely master?

REFERENCE

MINTZ, SIDNEY W., 1960. *Worker in the cane: a Puerto Rican life history*. New Haven, Yale University Press. (Translated into French by Jacqueline Rouah and published in 1979 as *Taso*. Paris, Francois Maspero.)

MICHÈLE BAJ STROBEL
97370 Maripasoula
French Guiana

Caribbean migrants: environment and human survival on St. Kitts and Nevis. BONHAM C. RICHARDSON. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1983. xiii + 209 pp. (Cloth US\$ 19.95, Paper US\$ 12.50)

Richardson's study is as much about the denuding effect of 350 years of intensive cultivation on fragile island ecosystems as it is about migration, and as much about the Caribbean's past and future as it is about its present. The author asserts with urgency: "The area's physical environments — destabilized, modified, and depleted by centuries of colonial control — do not support and cannot guarantee the success of livelihood strategies based entirely on local resources and opportunities" (p. 8). The book departs deliberately, then, from the present-bound consideration that often beclouds public opinion, policy, and even migration scholarship.

The push towards political decolonization that peaked in the past few decades, while important, has inadvertently allowed for a convenient demarcation of reality between the colonial condition and its aftermath — so much so that one detects noticeable impatience nowadays at mention of past domination. Focusing on the two former island colonies of St. Kitts and Nevis, Richardson effectively shows that colonization set in motion a chain of events

that cannot be ended by political decree or by perceptual amnesia. In human and ecological terms the consequences of colonization in St. Kitts and Nevis have been prolonged and irreversible.

European settlers, relying heavily on the labor of their African slaves, cleared much of the existing forest cover within the first few decades for fuel and building materials, and to make way for intensive export crop cultivation. This systematic deforestation, along with the grazing practiced by European-introduced animal species, initiated permanent environmental changes. As Richardson remarks succinctly: "... the climatic perturbations of the area now became environmental hazards" (p. 12). Chronic soil erosion, greater susceptibility to severe drought, and the extinction of several plant and animal species are just a few of the environmental costs the author discusses.

Richardson's emphasis on the ecological question provides an indispensable context for considering Caribbean migration. Monocrop cultivation has, in the first instance, depleted the fertility of the land and prevented the production of food staples. At the same time, it has created a surplus population (because of its need for large amounts of labor) that cannot be sustained adequately by existing resources. Against this backdrop the author describes in detail what he calls the "mobile livelihood system" that has propelled Kittitians and Nevisians to seek work in other islands of the Eastern Caribbean, Bermuda, the Dominican Republic, the Dutch Antilles, Britain, Canada, and the United States.

Individual emigrant motivation and pay-off — the major pre-occupations of the push/pull school of migration theory — and the impact of structural shifts in the international economy, are both treated in Richardson's account. Neither of these theoretical currents occupies center stage, however. Instead, Richardson argues persuasively for a local-level approach that views migration as an outcome of particular cultural and environmental circumstances and that, in turn, helps to re-form the home culture and environment. So, for instance, the author shows how the post-emancipation migrations to and from these islands has contributed to reformulating their status systems. Or again, he points

out that the purchase of livestock, though a rational investment strategy for Nevisians who had earned money abroad, has since accelerated environmental deterioration of the island through overgrazing and thus contributed to the necessity for continued migration as a livelihood strategy.

While local-level analysis is one of the book's strengths, it is not always employed boldly or consistently. In his perfunctory discussion of kinship and its relation to migration, for instance, Richardson employs uncritically the outsider's categories of "stability" and "illegitimacy" to depict conjugal unions and the children born of them (p. 49). Moreover, important questions that might have been treated in just this kind of "micro-scale" approach go unasked. For example, one wonders how the migration trajectories of men and women differ, given the varying cultural expectations that impinge on males and females at different stages of the life cycle. Richardson's discussion of the relationship between migration and class position in St. Kitts and Nevis does use the "micro-scale" approach to good effect, although his demarcation between middle and lower class seems overly rigid. Paradoxically, this reader would have liked both a bit more ethnography and a bit more information on pertinent shifts in the international economy. (Why the changeover from Caribbean to East Indian laborers in Trinidad in the nineteenth century, and why the decline in labor demand in the Dominican Republic in 1930?)

Caribbean Migrants offers an extremely useful comparison of these two neighboring islands. Both were intensively cultivated sugar colonies, yet Nevis, always the more marginal producer of the two, underwent an almost complete changeover to cotton, then to a largely peasant-holding economy, in the early decades of this century. St. Kitts, on the other hand, has limped along in the international sugar market to the present. St. Kitts, though having less eroded and depleted soils, has experienced lower rates of population increase and reportedly poorer nutritional levels than its sister island of peasant producers. Woven through the book one finds contrasts such as these which Caribbean scholars and policy makers should find provocative and important.

Richardson, a geographer by training, mines the data reserves

of several scholarly disciplines. He makes extensive use of British Colonial Office reports and Parliamentary Papers for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and effectively incorporates the findings of historians, anthropologists, and other geographers. For the most part, this gives the work a pleasing "blurred genres" quality which, as Geertz remarks, typifies much of the best of contemporary scholarship. If the account slows at times it is only because, out of diffidence perhaps, its author departs from bold analysis and descends to the level of step by step chronology.

CHARLES V. CARNEGIE
Center for Latin American Studies
University of Florida
Gainesville FL 32611, U.S.A.

Tryin' to make it: adapting to the Bahamas. JOHN BREGENZER. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982. viii + 88 pp. (Cloth US\$ 18.00, Paper US\$ 7.25)

The Bahama Islands are one of the least studied — from a social science point of view — of the countries of the world. With over twenty-two inhabited islands, the Bahamas could provide scholars with a unique opportunity for studying ecological adaptation using various comparative methods. Such research would be facilitated by the island's well-documented history. La-Flamme's (1976) annotated bibliography, which aimed at completeness, lists only seventy-one items. A complete social science library on the Bahamas, including dissertations and unpublished student papers, fills only a three-foot shelf. Thus it is a notable event when a book on the Bahamas is published. Although John Bregenzner's research focused on the island of Eleuthera, the study is not a traditional ethnography but a theoretical work dealing with culture change.

Bregenzner begins by rejecting the "myth of the tropical isle," a myth which is being continually perpetrated by the Bahamian tourist industry. Each chapter starts with an interesting quotation, the most appropriate for the theme of the book being: "WHERE ARE THE PALM TREES? (Disappointed first re-

action of a U.S. college student arriving at Rock Sound))" (p. 57). Bregenzer's purpose, however, is not to debunk the myth, but "to present a generalization regarding the island of Eleuthera: the place is exposed, not isolated. It is subject to, shaped by, and adapted to great and fluctuating forces from outside. . . . The way of life on Eleuthera is regarded as a system, but as a system which is a functioning part in a much broader system" (p. 3).

In a series of short chapters Bregenzer presents descriptions of the ecology of the island and the islanders themselves (Afro-Americans who speak a dialect of English), the history of the Bahamas and Eleuthera, the demography of the island, the "human system" (a discussion of Eleutheran "social fragmentation"), a description of the three communities at the south end of Eleuthera (Rock Sound, Greencastle, and Bannerman Town, with populations of about 1000, 500 and 100, respectively), a theoretical discussion, and an epilogue.

Bregenzer examines several models for understanding culture change. His approach is to distinguish between overt culture (the real world, what the outside observer sees) and covert culture (a cognitive orientation of individuals) and to construct four logically possible linkages: 1) change in overt culture, then change in covert culture, 2) change in covert culture, then change in overt culture, 3) change in covert culture with no change in overt culture; and 4) change in the overt culture with no change in covert culture. It is the "type four linkage" (p. 78) which Bregenzer finds characterizes his Eleutheran communities. His methodology is to rank the three communities in terms of degree of exposure to the outside world (overt culture), with Rock Sound the most exposed and Bannerman Town the least. Data on covert culture were obtained by using two measures — a values test developed by William B. Rodgers for Abaco (another Bahamian island) and the Kahl test of individual modernism. The results show that the people of Rock Sound and Bannerman Town are similar, while the people of Greencastle differ from both. Bregenzer concludes: "Here the end points of a continuum of outward change appear to be associated with little change in individuals. On Eleuthera it seems to be at the midpoint of outward change that the changes in individuals have occurred" (p. 77). He finds

the explanation in the theme of his study — Eleuthera is an exposed island. “Eleutherans and Bahamians have had to adapt to an environment of fluctuating economic prosperity and fluctuating reliance on the outside world. It would seem to be a reasonable proposition that these people developed the covert side of their culture to cope with either extreme” (p. 78).

Specific strengths of the book are the five maps and the six-page bibliography which lists many Bahamian references. The study is historically and ethnographically accurate; no factual errors were found. There are no photographs or line drawings, nor is there an index. Since no biographical information on the author is provided, it is appropriate to state in this review that John Bregenzer received his Ph.D. degree from the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis in 1976. He is Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of Dayton, Ohio, where he has taught for many years.

REFERENCE

LAFLAMME, ALAN G., 1976. An annotated, ethnographic bibliography of the Bahama Islands. *Behavior Science Research* 11: 57–66.

KEITH F. OTTERBEIN
Department of Anthropology
State University of New York at Buffalo
Amherst NY 14261, U.S.A.

Cuba between empires, 1878–1902. LOUIS A. PEREZ. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982. xx + 490 pp. (Cloth US\$ 32.95)

Brilliantly written and based on solid research, Luis A. Perez's *Cuba between empires* is a book that explains why the origins of even today's hostilities in U.S.-Cuban relations are to be found in Cuba's frustrated struggle for independence at the end of the last century. Having fought long and courageously to win their freedom from the Spanish empire, Cuban patriots found their country ensnared in a new colonial system and their independence circumscribed by an even more powerful patron, the United States. As Perez notes, “The unfinished revolution of 1895–1898

gave decisive shape and content to republican politics, a legacy that served as a mandate to revolution for the next three generations of Cubans" (p. 386).

In many ways, Castro's Revolution originally sprang directly out of Cuba's shattered earlier dreams of full sovereignty. Certainly Castro saw it in those terms. As he entered Santiago de Cuba in triumph in January 1959, Castro noted acerbically that the struggle begun by Jose Martí was now complete and that General Shafter was no longer on the scene to deny Cubans their victory parade. (As Perez points out, the Commander of U.S. forces in Cuba, General William R. Shafter, who was also the fattest man in the U.S. army, refused to allow Cuban insurgent forces to participate in the triumphal march through the streets of Santiago in 1898, or even to enter the city.)

Beginning his saga in 1878, as the Ten-Years War for independence ended and a respite of almost twenty years began, Perez skillfully weaves developments in Cuba, Spain, and the United States into a composite whole. He explains the objectives and actions of each side and how the movements of one affected the positions of the other two. We thus have a complete view of the drama as it unfolds.

Perez describes the resumption of hostilities between Cuban insurgents and Spanish troops in 1895, Spain's efforts to quell the new uprising, first with a velvet glove, then with an iron fist, and, finally, exhausted, with a scheme for autonomy. But it was too late. Cuba's insurgent armies, led by Maximo Gomez, knew victory was within their grasp; they had no intention of settling for anything less than full sovereignty. Then enter the United States. For a century, the bottom line of U.S. policy with respect to Cuba had been to prevent its transfer from Spain to any other power and to oppose Cuban independence. The U.S. preferred the status quo until such time as Cuba, in the words of John Quincy Adams, fell like an apple into the bosom of the North American Union. In pursuing this policy, the United States had several times tried to buy Cuba from Spain, it had refused to grant belligerent rights to Cuban rebels during the Ten-Years War (1868-1878), and from 1895 forward it refused either to extend such rights to the new generation of insurgents or to indicate support for their cause, i.e.

independence. Even after the U.S. entered the war against Spain and landed an expeditionary force in eastern Cuba, it studiously avoided recognition of the Cuban insurgent government — though the latter was ostensibly its ally.

As Cuba was now falling from Spain's apple tree, one would have expected the U.S. to seize it as one the fruits of Teddy Roosevelt's "splendid little war." But this did not happen. If there is any weakness in Perez's book, it is in his explanation of why it did not. As he emphasizes early in his narrative, eventual acquisition of Cuba had been a prophetic imperative accepted by the Founding Fathers and by most of the American body politic since the days of Thomas Jefferson. Yet, just as the island seemed within grasp, the United States foreswore its acquisition. Attached to Congress' Joint Resolution on U.S. intervention was an amendment submitted by Senator Henry M. Teller of Colorado. In accordance with its provisions, the U.S. disclaimed "any intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for pacification thereof."

The Teller Amendment went against an American shibboleth of a century's standing. Why was it accepted by the U.S. Congress? Perez suggests that while President McKinley's purpose may have been the annexation of Cuba, Cuban independence had long been a sacred and emotional cause in Congress. Yet, Perez acknowledges that only four years earlier, Senator Teller himself had strongly favored annexation. One can easily understand *his* metamorphosis. The sugar beet industry in his state had come into its own between 1894 and 1898; he wished to protect it by keeping Cuba, with its vast cane fields, on the other side of the national boundary.

But what of his colleagues? Why did they go along with his amendment? Surely sentiment for independence could not have been so strong. Various Cuban scholars since 1959 have insisted that the Teller Amendment only passed because the Cuban Council in New York, i.e., the government in exile, bought the votes of enough U.S. senators to see it through. This is also an unsatisfactory explanation. Perhaps bribery was involved in a few individual cases, but it seems most unlikely that enough votes could have been bought to assure passage without the whole thing having become a public scandal.

Perez notes also that the Cuban Council was horrified at the idea of U.S. intervention without some expression of support for Cuban independence. They had even indicated that without it, Cuban troops would fight the U.S. as well as Spain. That might have been a temporary embarrassment, but U.S. strategists must have doubted that the Cubans had the will or wherewithal to carry it out, and even if they did, that they could long prevail against U.S. arms.

Perez notes that the commitment to Cuban independence reflected in the Teller Amendment "rested fragiley on a fleeting but convenient convergence of special interests." He makes a more creditable effort than any American historian with whose works I am acquainted to explain this sudden about-face in U.S. policy. In the end, however, the explanation seemed to me to be insufficient. But if a flaw, it is indeed a small one in an otherwise fascinating and even exciting work.

Finally, as one reads this account of how Cuba freed itself from Spanish domination only to fall under that of the U.S., one cannot but note that, in a sense, history has repeated itself, or at least completed still another cycle. Cuba freed itself from Spain but came under U.S. domination. Castro freed it from U.S. domination, only to bring it under that of the Soviet Union. A sequel to Perez's book, then, might well be entitled *Cuba among three empires*.

WAYNE S. SMITH

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Washington D.C. 20036, U.S.A.

Cuba: a handbook of historical statistics. SUSAN SCHROEDER. Boston: G. K. Hall, International Historical Statistical Series, 1982. xlii + 589 pp. (Cloth US\$ 85.00).

This is a massive work which provides a comprehensive statistical panorama of Cuban society over several centuries. The volume contains 482 statistical tables covering demography, education, labor force, employment and wages, agricultural and industrial production, mining, energy, construction, communications, cul-

ture, sports, foreign trade, public debt, foreign aid, public finance and government budgets, tourism, public officials, banking and finance, national income accounts, and price indices. Some tables provide scattered coverage from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, but most of the materials relate to the present century.

Schroeder is to be commended for compiling in one volume an abundance of statistical materials, many of them difficult to obtain. This book will become a handy reference volume for Cuban scholars, especially in terms of its bibliographic usage.

On the other hand, given the complexity of the undertaking (e.g., wide historical scope, multiplicity of sources, and changes in social systems), the degree of success of this publication in terms of actual research capabilities depends greatly on the quality of the editorial contribution. In this case, it is glaringly poor. Instead of solid historical background, careful methodological evaluation, and precise critical writing, we find simplistic generalizations and sloppy commentaries. Some examples will suffice to illustrate my assessments.

Though the book contains over 500 pages of statistical materials, the main introduction occupies a mere nine pages, of which six are devoted to painfully basic historical notes. Thus, in only three pages the author attempts, with limited success, to deal with key issues concerning statistical availability and reliability, and the non-comparability of pre- and post-revolutionary data. In fact, what we find even in this limited space, are long citations from her academic mentor regarding the uses and pitfalls of historical statistics. It is true that each chapter is preceded by introductory comments tailored to the topics covered within, but in general the author further engages in historical simplifications or simply previews what is to be presented.

For instance, Schroeder states that "the Cubans were unable to make any long-term commitment for economic development because of a lack of professional statisticians, the U.S. embargo, and the vagaries of the weather" (p. 488). But obviously statisticians can be trained in a few years, socialist markets and aid were made quickly available to the island, and good planning should make allowances for the weather and other uncertainties. In some cases, carelessness in the reading of the data is quite apparent.

Schroeder writes that "tobacco production during the twentieth century has not varied significantly, except during the late 1970's ..." (p. 234). However, Table IX.30 (p. 264) — mislabeled metric tons, when it should be thousands of metric tons — shows that tobacco output reached 130,000 tons in 1936 and 1946, and then fluctuated from 30,000 to 60,000 tons in the 1950s. Table IX.31 (p. 267), presenting data only through 1976, indicates a stable level of tobacco production (around 50,000 tons) since 1960, except for two years.

In addition, some of the remarks found in the chapter introductions must be characterized as gross mistakes. The author states that "in 1960 the Ministry of Labor . . . decided that money would no longer be used as an incentive for workers. Moral incentives were to motivate society as a whole" (p. 180). In fact, only after 1962 was this policy implemented in selected sectors, especially the Ministry of Industry under Guevara, whereas the economy-wide introduction of moral incentives took place in 1966. In her treatment of the 1971 policy change involving the return to material incentives and the reduction of the money supply, Schroeder declares that "the results of the new policy can be seen on Table VII.13" (p. 181); but the table shows average wages by state economic sectors in 1962–1966!

Another flaw in the chapter introductions is that there is little or no discussion related to the sources being used, the quality of the data, or potential contradictions among similar tables. Consider, for example, the following data extracted from Table V.1 (pp. 122–24), headed "Cuban Schools, Teachers and Enrollments, 1882–1978":

	<i>Schools</i>	<i>Teachers</i>
1962	16,164	46,936
1963	34,440	75,146
1968	37,703	103,129
1969	15,804	81,191

What kinds of schools are included: primary, secondary, or both? What types of teachers are counted: regular, popular (i.e., non-professional), or both? What accounted for a gain of 30,000

teachers in 1963 and a loss of 22,000 teachers in 1969? How to explain the year-to-year variations in the number of schools: counting classrooms vs. schools? (On this issue, the table footnotes add more confusion than clarification.)

Consider also the potentially misleading nature of Table IV.10 (p. 112), dealing with Cuban immigrants to the United States admitted as residents under INS criteria. In 1960-1962, the table shows small inflows (8,000 to 16,000 immigrants) simply because most Cubans emigrated to the U.S. under visa waivers instead of residency permits. A more accurate picture of the Cuban exodus of this period is contained in the international migration tables of the *Anuario Estadístico de Cuba 1976*, cited by the author many times elsewhere in the volume. About 65,000 Cubans emigrated annually in 1960-1962, and most of them were ultimately destined for the U.S.

In sum, to turn this book into a valuable research tool, the user must be aware of its many shortcomings. There are classifications and terms to define, statistical quirks to explain, and historical facts to correct. It is lamentable that this volume, which according to the author developed from work done at a graduate seminar, could not rise above the level of a sophomoric effort.

SERGIO ROCA
Department of Economics
Adelphi University
Garden City NY 11530, U.S.A.

The Dominican people 1850-1900: notes for a historical sociology. H. HOETINK. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, Johns Hopkins Studies in Atlantic History and Culture, 1982, 243 pp. (Cloth US\$ 22.50)

The intent of Hoetink's *The Dominican people 1850-1900* (the translation of *El pueblo Dominicano*) is to bring the preliminary results of a continuing investigation to the attention of "others interested in the sociological aspects of the history of the Dominican Republic" (p. x). The book consists of a collection of "notes," drawn mainly from archival sources and primary documents, that comprise

fruitful steps toward a "historical sociology" of the Dominican Republic between the early years of independence from Haiti and the end of the nineteenth century.

The book is organized into chapters on agrarian life, demography, communications, economics, politics, culture, society, and the family, each conceptualized as a "structure." These are not highly abstract or formal categories, nor elements of a specific paradigm, but rather general categories. Given that Hoetink researched the book in the 1960s, and given the state of knowledge about the Dominican Republic at that time and the author's earlier research, this orientation does not seem inappropriate, as long as the reader does not mistake the movement toward a historical sociology with the accomplishment of that goal.

This structural argument is consistent with the types of sources Hoetink employs. In the section on political ideas, for example, he quotes extensively from letters written by key figures of the period: Gregorio Luperón, Ulises Heureaux, Pedro F. Bonó, Fr. Fernando Arturo Meriño, et al. Although he mentions that Heureaux often quoted Talleyrand, to the effect that words can be used to conceal thought, Hoetink appears to believe that he can read this correspondence as a faithful record of nineteenth-century values, intentions, and methods. What results from this discussion, unfortunately, is a top-heavy interpretation of the necessity of caudillo politics which often reads as justification rather than explanation.

Sources such as letters and government reports, of course, do not lend themselves easily to macrosociological analysis. One necessarily remains at the level of "historical sociology" out of which emerges no definitive theory of Dominican society. There are no theoretical devices to show how the (structural) pieces fit together, nor are there models of social structure that take into account actors at other levels of Dominican society — those who do not write letters or leave documents.

What these sources do provide, on the other hand, are often intimate glimpses of life and thought among the Dominican elites during the post-Independence period. Hoetink analyzes the "heroic ideology" of the elites and the people's response to a change of government — most often by revolution — with re-

ference to a relationship between the elites' narcissism and problems of political legitimacy, which in turn was reflected in the weakness of Dominican institutions. With compelling insight, Hoetink describes the processes whereby people changed political parties fluidly and the circumstances in which once-revered leaders were reviled at death. In one of the few passages where he steps outside the temporal bounds of his study, Hoetink draws a comparison between the public reaction to the death of Heureaux and that of Trujillo.

In addition, Hoetink's presentation provides occasional reminders of the horizontal linkages among the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and Puerto Rico (not to mention Curaçao) during these decades. In 1881, for instance, the Spanish encouraged an invasion of the Dominican Republic, due in good part to the fact that the Cuban general Antonio Maceo was in their former colony. The invasion was led by General Guillermo, who obtained financing from the Casa Gallart in Ponce, Puerto Rico (p. 121). This event is a reminder that the struggles in which criollo elites battled the Spanish state — politically or militarily — involved more than the parochial concerns of the individual islands.

The narrative is spiced with apt references to Eugenio María de Hostos, the Puerto Rican sociologist and educator who spent many years in the Dominican Republic. Hostos's words likewise underscore the linkages among the Spanish Antilles during the era following the Grito de Lares and the Grito de Yara. These passages confirm Hoetink's meticulous reading of the contemporaneous literature as much as they affirm the importance of Hostos as an unparalleled observer who captured the tenor of Dominican society in amazingly modern terms. For example, Hostos called the relative absence of people of color in Baní "a veritable ethnological parenthesis" (p. 27). And the Puerto Rican sociologist labeled the use of weapons in the countryside "armed ignorance" (p. 100).

When Hostos became too idealistic for Hoetink's taste, however, especially in comparison with the "more realistic" Bonó, Hoetink dismisses Hostos as having a "not very practical mentality" (p. 112). The discussion of Hostos's role in Dominican society, and mention of visits by Jose Martí, the "ever-exiled"

Ramón Emeterio Betances, and others, give *The Dominican people* a sense of historical immediacy that is not always present in works on this period.

The book ends — not unexpectedly — without a proper conclusion and so must this review. It is pertinent to note, however, that the comprehension of an historical period is not necessarily the same as the understanding of it. *The Dominican people* is not a book with which to introduce oneself to nineteenth-century Dominican history, but one to read as a tool to mull over key issues in the interpretation of that history.

JAMES W. WESSMAN

Departments of Puerto Rican, Latin American
and Caribbean Studies, and Anthropology
The State University of New York
Albany NY 12222, U.S.A.

Santo Domingo: tierra de frontera, 1750–1800. MARIA ROSARIO SEVILLA SOLER. Seville: Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos, 1980. xx + 502 pp. (Cloth 1800 ptas)

In this book, Sevilla Soler presents the research that she conducted for her doctoral dissertation at the University of Sevilla in Spain. Her thesis involves the study of the society of Santo Domingo (now the Dominican Republic) from different points of view; it focuses on a little-studied historical period, 1750–1800. The book is divided into ten chapters.

The first, rather unpretentious, chapter offers geographical information on Santo Domingo, the first Spanish colony in the Americas. In spite of being the least ambitious chapter and containing some historical errors, it manages to provide a quite good geographical summary.

The second chapter is a serious in-depth study of the Dominican population. It arrives at the conclusion that the population, like the cities, increased substantially during the period in question: the number of settlements rose from eleven to twenty-one between 1736 and 1795. Sevilla Soler argues that the increase was produced by Spanish immigrants from the Canary Islands.

She also asserts that Dominican society was predominantly rural and that the social distance between classes was relatively small — so much that the black slaves were treated better in this colony than anywhere else in the Caribbean.

The third chapter develops the thesis that the economy of Santo Domingo was based primarily on the raising of livestock. It argues that agriculture was limited for a variety of reasons, including the paucity of white inhabitants and black slaves, a lack of capital and technology, the presence of hurricanes, the commercial monopoly of Europe, and the failure of the Spanish Crown to invest money in the island. Agriculture was aimed mainly at subsistence needs, and exported very little. The main crops were sugar cane, cacao, coffee, cotton, maize, rice, bananas, ginger, root crops, and above all, tobacco. The diet consisted principally of bananas, manioc, sweet potatoes, rice, and maize. This chapter explores its subject in great depth.

The fourth chapter is devoted almost entirely to the subject of livestock. It asserts that while cattle raising was the economic backbone of Santo Domingo, a substantial part of the population lived by hunting, especially in the northeastern region. The animals most commonly hunted included wild pigs, horses, sheep, goats, and above all, cattle. People ate beef more than any other meat, and the cowhides were exported for sale, mainly to the French colony on the western portion of the island.

The fifth chapter, which is a well-researched study of trade, serves to fill a serious gap in Dominican historiography. It discusses the colony's trade relations with Spain, with other Spanish colonies in the Americas, and with French, English, and Dutch colonies in the Caribbean. It reaches the conclusion that during the entire period under study, the Dominican balance of trade ran a deficit. The chapter contains a variety of interesting statistical tables dealing with import/export patterns.

The sixth chapter deals with the structure of tax collecting in the colony, enumerating the various positions in the system and the salary that each one carried. It also discusses government efficiency, and analyzes accounting procedures, support of public works, management of the budget, arrears in salary-payments and circulation of currency.

The seventh chapter studies the structure of the government, with a special focus on the *Real Audiencia* (Royal Court). It attempts to define the extent of each functionary's authority and gives detailed salary figures. Finally, it enumerates the various Spanish cabinets in office between 1750 and 1800.

The eighth chapter provides an in-depth analysis of the army in Santo Domingo, dealing with such topics as size of the troops, salaries, internal organization, customs, arrears in the payment of salaries, and national origins (Spanish, Dominican, Dutch, English, etc.) of the soldiers.

The ninth chapter focuses on relations between the French and Spanish colonies that shared the island, and argues that there was always heavy contraband traffic across the border. This chapter also examines the various attempts that were made to establish a more well defined border between the eastern and western areas of the island.

In the final chapter, Sevilla Soler studies the political effects of the French Revolution on the entire island of Santo Domingo. Here, she gives particular importance to the Treaty of Basil in 1975, which ceded part of the island to France.

This book provides a well-researched study, based on an excellent bibliography and, above all, on contemporary documents now in the Archivo General de la Nación in the Dominican Republic, and the Archivo General de Simancas and the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid. I recommend it highly.

FRANK PENÄ PÉREZ
Department of Research
Universidad APEC
Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic

Inmigración y clases sociales en el Puerto Rico del siglo XIX. FRANCISO A. SCARANO (ed.). Río Piedras, Puerto Rico: Ediciones Huracán, 1981. 208 pp. (Paper US\$ 5.95)

The five essays in this volume are a substantial contribution to the social history of Puerto Rico. Neglected dimensions in the constitution of the Puerto Rican nationality, and especially the pro-

minent role of immigrants in that process during the final decades of Spanish rule are delineated by the several authors. The first four analyses directly engage the question of the class placement of these immigrants and their impact on the principal economic activities of the colony. The final piece, "The dehumanization of labor, the reification of nature," while not dealing with immigration, does cast new light on the formation of a native working class in the countryside, where Spanish colonists and other settlers from abroad figured prominently as large landowners. Altogether, the volume situates the island's history in the larger panorama of international exchanges that brought Puerto Rico into the framework of world trade and the local development of capitalist relations of production.

Scarano's "Immigration and class structures: the *hacendados* of Ponce, 1815-1845" brings into bold relief the intricate web of relations linking foreign capitals, immigrants, and imported slaves in the production and export of cane and sugar with the resultant social tensions dividing Spanish colonists, newcomers from other nations (notably French, Corsicans, and Netherlands), and an emergent local proprietary class. Astrid T. Cubano Iguina persuasively depicts the mechanisms through which Spanish traders established and maintained hegemonic controls over these local producers. Laird W. Bergad provides a well-fashioned complement to Scarano and Iguina in his account of the rivalries and conflicts between native and immigrant coffee growers and Spanish traders, which were part of the prelude to the Lares insurrection. Finally, the compact monograph by Andrés Ramos Mattei singles out for attention the immigration of Black workers from the British Caribbean, rounding out the picture of social class formation during the nineteenth century.

Despite the diversity of topics and individual approaches, the several pieces achieve a substantial unity in the careful reconstruction of social relations emerging from economic transformations. The use of primary sources and well ordered data assures the collection a lasting interest. One minor lapse bears mention. The emigration of Puerto Rican workers in the nineteenth century dates from the 1870s rather than the 1890s, as is indicated in the editor's introduction, and was bound for Cuba and the

Dominican Republic. This volume is must reading for all interested in the history of Puerto Rico and the Caribbean.

RICARDO CAMPOS ORTA
Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños
Hunter College
New York NY 10021, U.S.A.

Puerto Rican literature: a bibliography of secondary sources. Compiled by DAVID WILLIAM FOSTER. Westport CT & London: Greenwood Press, 1982. 232 pp. (Cloth US\$ 35.00)

Bibliographies of Puerto Rican *literature* are, generally speaking, as unsatisfying and incomplete as they are scarce. The image, inextricable from the island's colonial status, of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans as a "minority" — and therefore "marginal" — culture has no doubt contributed to a bibliographical production that leans rather heavily toward the more strictly historical, sociological, or quasi-anthropological in focus and intent. An underlying, usually unarticulated, position in the continuing debate regarding the character and the definition itself of "Puerto Rican culture" invariably informs the compiler's enterprise. The latter of course unavoidably pervades any discussion of Puerto Rican affairs. The relative insufficiency of the crop of bibliographies broadly and specifically devoted to its literature is, nonetheless, striking. Indeed, compared in both number and quality with those dedicated to other Latin American literatures (and excepting those few devoted to individual notables such as Palés Matós and Rene Marqués), they seem sometimes hardly to exist at all.

Of those available, several are already outdated. (Of a total of thirty-six items listed by Foster under "Bibliographies," more than a third date back to a period between 1907 and 1953; the remainder is made up almost entirely of "*bibliografías mínimas*," catalogs to specific collections, genre studies, or the "occasional" compilations sponsored by any number of journals.) They are of only limited use to a generation of researchers weaned, not on the

impressionistic, patrician certainties of a "Great Tradition" or the exegetic myosis of the New Critical canon, but on the interpretive revisionism of everything from Gramscian and Frankfurt School Marxism to the multiple variants of existentialism, structuralism, post-structuralism, and semiotics. To this limitation must, of course, be added the rich literary production that has succeeded their distant publication. Others, like Paquita Vivó's relatively current *The Puerto Ricans: an annotated bibliography* (1973), give literature only as much attention as the scope of their broader ambition allows; some, like Eugene V. Mohr's "Fifty years of Puerto Rican literature in English: 1923-1973: an annotated bibliography," represent only an initial, tentative, necessarily provisional, exploration of an area still virtually untouched by bibliographers. By implication at least, the latter, as timid and conceptually inchoate as it is, points encouragingly to more inclusive definitions of our "national" literature and the need for a critical method appropriate to that task. To the degree that it presses for recognition, as a branch of Puerto Rican literature, of the work of those writers formed in the crucible of "*la emigración*," it challenges the conventionally fixed, class-conscious, and exclusive contours of "our literary patrimony"; like the more analytically probing work of Ricardo Campos, Juan Flores, and the Centro de Estudios de la Realidad Puertorriqueña (CEREP), they underscore the shrewd perception of José Luis González's comments on the "national identity" of their literary production (see Arcadio Díaz Quiñones, *Conversación con José Luis González* [1976]). M.D. Hill and H. B. Schleiffer's *Puerto Rican authors: a bibliographic handbook* (1974) has both the specificity and nominal scope but, a compendium designed primarily as an "introductory" guide, it is synoptic rather than comprehensive. As Professor Foster points out, it also does not include the criticism available on the authors it includes. It also appears to accept, without comment or critical examination, the patrician definition of Puerto Rican culture inherited from an earlier age.

One is all the more predisposed to welcome gratefully a new bibliography which, adding significantly to our store of available scholarly resources, promises to be "a registry of representative criticism on major figures" that will fill the void occasioned by our

lack of any "comprehensive critical bibliography of Puerto Rican authors . . ." That it is the work of a distinguished scholar, with previous bibliographies on the literature of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina to his credit, gives weight and substance to the promise and heightens our sense of delighted expectation. A genuinely important contribution to the modest shelf of Puerto Rican bibliographies, Professor Foster's work nonetheless strikes one, within what emerge finally as restrictive and fairly conventional categories, as an uneven and sometimes oddly inconsistent compilation. Though hardly a disappointment, it is still not precisely what one might have hoped it would be.

The key difficulty here, of course, is the scope and definition of "major." There is also the problem of what one regards as "the [concrete] demands of a serious contemporary, generally intrinsic, criticism." One need not quarrel with the obvious impracticability of listing *all* known references, "especially those in general audience magazines and newspapers," or deny that "it is not the bibliographer's task to distinguish between competent and incompetent criticism, nor to restrict his compilation to essays representing a certain trend or range of trends . . ." in order to ask for a more substantive articulation of categories than Foster provides. The need is all the more compelling in view of the text's format, some of its conceptual subdivisions, the general absence of cross-references, and, of course, some of its more inexplicable omissions.

The book is divided into two parts, the first of which is devoted to "General References." These are subdivided into twenty-three individually titled subject headings. To the usual focus on topics by genre (bibliographies, general histories, poetry, prose fiction, essays, drama) and epoch (colonial, nineteenth and twentieth centuries), is added a welcome section on "Women authors." Another on "Relations with foreign literatures" is complemented by such elusively catch-all, sometimes seemingly arbitrary, rubrics as "Literature and other subjects" and "Special topics . . .". The unexpected brevity of some of these sections, a number of which list no more than ten short items, properly gives the measure of how much may still remain to be done but, simultaneously, leaves one wondering at the appropriateness of the compiler's classifications and, in the absence of repeated ref-

erences, the specific content of his criteria for inclusion under one rather than another subdivision. Why, for example, is Edna Acosta-Belén's "Ideología e imágenes de la mujer en la literatura puertorriqueña contemporánea," listed under "General studies on twentieth-century literature" and excluded from the section on "Women authors," while the same author's "Literature and ideology in the works of the Puerto Rican generation of 1950" is included in both "General studies" and "Literature and other subjects"? It would seem to be a *prima facie* candidate for such inclusion. Does "ideology," in either case, constitute a sufficiently separate category to justify its inclusion in "Other subjects" but not in "Women authors"? Why, again, are Rosario Ferré's essays on feminists as diverse as Mary Shelly, Jean Rhys, Alexandra Kollantai, Virginia Woolf and Julia de Burgos, collected in *Sitio a Eros*, nowhere in evidence? Surely they, like their author, who is missing from the latter portion of the book as well, belong in a bibliography such as this one. The inclusion of Maldonado Denis' comments on the literary and cultural scene, controversial as they might be, is certainly justified. But why favor his essays on the great patricians — at least one of whom (Betances) arguably does not rank as a strictly *literary* figure — and overlook his commentary on "La temática social en la literatura puertorriqueña," "El papel del intelectual en el Puerto Rico de hoy," and possibly one other of those brought together in *Puerto Rico: mito y realidad*? Is the inclusion of Roger Baglin's "The mainland experience in selected Puerto Rican literary works" under "Special literary topics" (rather than, say, "General studies on twentieth-century literature") meant to indicate a judgment of the degree to which the subject is "intrinsically" germane to Puerto Rican literature? The lack of any section devoted to "Puerto Rican literature in the diaspora," for lack of a better name, leads one to wonder further. Surely it has a claim on our attention at least as compelling as our "Relations with foreign literatures." It would, undoubtedly, result in a considerably richer harvest of entries. The fact that Juan Flores' critique of Antonio S. Pedreira finds its proper place, while his fairly accessible and equally worthy "La carreta made a U-turn" (*Daedalus* 1981) does not, adds to our perplexity in the face of some of Foster's more novel categories. The omissions, no

less than the placing of his inclusions, can occasionally appear bafflingly capricious. As an ancillary, but not entirely negligible, consequence of these inconsistencies, the reader is given the impression that the extant lacunae are even larger than is warranted by the available material. The newcomer to Puerto Rican literature is particularly vulnerable and, consulting this work, would do well to consider the less conventional subdivisions of General References as no more than suggestive.

The second part, devoted to critical works on specific authors, comprises approximately two-thirds of the volume, and is both more internally consistent and more richly rewarding. Some of the same questions do, however, occasionally arise. What does it mean, for example to say that Betances and Muñoz Rivera, as producers of "literature" rather than as "pensadores" or "políticos," are "major"? If our definition of the latter is more broadly "cultural," can figures such as Jesús Colón and, more recently, Bernardo Vega be ignored? Does not the work of Manuel Ramos Otero, Edgardo Rodríguez-Juliá, and Tomás López Ramírez recommend them to the first comprehensive critical bibliography of Puerto Rican literature? But the fault, in this case, lies less with the bibliographer than with the traditional foci and inclinations of our conventional scholarship. The general parameters of Foster's premises here are not nearly as elusive. The selection, which includes several writers of the colonial period, favors authors from the latter nineteenth century through the generation of 1950. With a total of 80 writers represented, the average number of entries per author hovers at approximately 14. Not unexpectedly, José de Diego, Luis Lloréns Torres, Manuel A. Zeno Gandía, Enrique LaGuerre, René Marqués, Evaristo Ribera Chevre-mont, and Luis Palés Matós, each with between 46 and 151 entries, emerge as the most frequently examined of the writers. Eugenio María de Hostos, with 277 items listed, is by far the most imposing. Of the post-Marqués generation, barely represented here, only Luis Rafael Sánchez, with 37 items listed, has attracted anything like a comparable amount of attention; and, among colonial subjects, only Bernardo de Balbuena runs in this company.

Although one may lament the absence of the odd commentary

here and there — E. Barradas' study of Luis Rafael Sánchez, *Para leerse en puertorriqueño*, for instance — the references to the bibliographies, monographs, dissertations, and critical essays the "Authors" have inspired are generally complete and current. Annotations would have enhanced their time-saving value. The "Index to authors of critical works" provides a form of easy access that can, in a pinch, also serve as a cross-reference to authors who are themselves critics. The scant attention to writers who have emerged since the 1960s — a few of whom, at least, have achieved a certain renown — may date this compilation more quickly than would otherwise have been the case. The disregard of authors within the United States, expanding as they defy our notions of "the canon," further weakened the volume's claim to being inclusively Puerto Rican. This second division is, nonetheless, the strongest, most convincingly articulated one in the book.

One is finally left with the impression that this bibliography is more effectively "selective" than broadly "representative." Within the limits of its assumptions, however, Professor Foster's bibliography is a fine work that may be profitably consulted by anyone interested in the serious study of some of our more eminent *hommes de lettres*. If it is not precisely the authentically "comprehensive" bibliography one might have hoped for, one is still indebted to its author for what, with all its remediable shortcomings, remains a significant and useful contribution to the field.

ROBERTO MÁRQUEZ
School of Humanities & Arts
Hampshire College
Amherst MA 01002, U.S.A.

Haiti, land of poverty. ROBERT TATA. Washington: University Press of America, 1982. xi + 127 pp. (Cloth US\$ 18.75, Paper US\$ 8.25)

Robert Tata has written yet another book documenting the existence of extreme poverty in Haiti. This one is a geographic study which uses systems theory and functional analysis to examine Haiti's "prospects for modernization." In terms of its

basic stance, *Haiti, land of poverty* is parallel to Rotberg's *Politics of squalor* (1971) or Lundahl's *Peasants and poverty* (1979). Unlike the latter works, Tata's study shows much less familiarity with the literature on Haiti, even within the discipline of geography, and little or no personal experience of Haiti. As a library study, the work makes no mention of the leading Haitian geographer, Anglade (1974, 1982), or the classic work by Moral (1961). There is no reference to earlier standard works such as Woodring, Brown and Burbank (1924) or Butterlin (1954). The study relies heavily on secondary sources, major government reports (Organization of American States, World Bank, United States Government) and journalistic accounts. Aside from the OAS report (1972) there is little use of foreign language sources, especially Haitian or French publications, and no mention of the Haitian journal, *Revue de la Société d'Histoire et de Géographie d'Haiti*.

Chapters are devoted to the study of four interrelated "systems" which make up Haitian society. The structure and functioning of these physical, social, economic, and political systems are examined with a view to determining their success in promoting human welfare. In conclusion, Haiti's poverty is explained as the result of the malfunctioning of these systems. Haiti is "not viable" in the short or long term, and social improvements "will have to depend on international charity" (pp. 108-09).

The author seems distant from his material. There is a lack of textured description or reflective understanding of the cultural domain. Other information is dated or simply inaccurate. For example, charcoal is not the major cooking fuel of peasants (14); the peasant fuel is wood. To state that rural-urban migration is "barely visible" is inexcusable (26). Tata overestimates the level of illiteracy and underrates the role of Protestantism (28). The discussion of family organization is unreliable (29). It is incorrect to say that religion is not influential in national affairs, or that the "elite" regard Catholicism as a foreign institution (31). To imply that Haiti's alleged "rich cultural heritage" is a "myth" is prejudiced and wrong (29). It is a gross error to suggest that most farmers "hardly enter the exchange economy" (43), or that the *coumbite* is the primary form of extra-familial labor (55), or that "ignorance, superstition and fatalism" are the dominant characteristics of this society (113).

There is recognition of regressive political tendencies but no clear analysis of class, culture, or the integration of peasants into the national economy; and there is no discussion of the pivotal role of indirect taxation. The strongest feature of the study is a sequence of fourteen tables and twelve maps. These provide useful summaries of important information on climate and economy. The road map is out of date, but there are useful maps of government jurisdictions, travel time with 4-wheel drive jeeps, and major hurricanes of the twentieth century and their tracks across the Haitian landscape.

REFERENCES

- ANGLADE, GEORGES, 1974. *L'espace Haitien*. Montreal, University of Quebec.
- , 1982. *Atlas critique d'Haiti*. Montreal, ERCE and CRC.
- BUTTERLIN, JACQUES, 1954. *La géologie de la République d'Haiti et ses rapports avec les régions voisines*, Paris: Imprimerie Jouve.
- MORAL, PAUL, 1961. *Le paysan Haitien (Etude sur la vie rurale en Haiti)*. Paris, G. P. Maisonneuve & Larose.
- WOODRING, W.P., J.A. BROWN, & W.S. BURBANK, 1924. *Geology of the Republic of Haiti*. Baltimore: The Lord Baltimore Press.
- GLENN R. SMUCKER
Pan American Development Foundation
BP 15574, Petionville, Haiti.

De foltering van Eldorado: een ecologische geschiedenis van de vijf Guyana's. ALBERT HELMAN. 's-Gravenhage: Nijgh & Van Ditmar, 1983. 495 pp. (Cloth Dfl. 85.00)

Albert Helman's writings are of an amazing and enviable quality and quantity. He is an historian, essayist, linguist, novelist, poet, playwright, and politician. With a youthful vitality the eighty-year-old Helman has written "The torment of Eldorado." It is an impressive book of 495 pages, which he calls his testament. In it he presents his view of his land of origin in a broad sense: the process of development of Greater Guyana, its flora, fauna, and people, its

past, present, and future, Provocative as always, Helman sets out to explain once and for all how he came to write his previous book, *Avonturen aan de Wilde Kust*, (Adventures on the Wild Coast). The deliberately ambiguous title refers to the torturing of the land and the people by the gold-hungry usurpers (who themselves suffered from Eldorado's revenging spirit).

Helman has drawn his material from secondary literature. Exhaustive study of these sources as well as his insight and experience opened his eyes to the fact that one can describe the history of his country from a non-European point of view. This attitude is not entirely new, as may be gathered from his own bibliography. This bibliography is impressive, though incomplete; one wonders why Helman has given no footnotes and no index, for these would have been helpful for serious scholars.

Helman's mastery shows in his knowledgeable reviews, his beautiful lyrical descriptions, his clever analysis, his inspired prognoses, and his uninhibited vituperations. The book covers many centuries and is loaded with information on the Brazilian, Venezuelan, French, (formerly) English, and (formerly) Dutch Guianas. While the more recent periods are described with greater detail, the unity of conception and style is beautifully retained. After describing the impressive rock-paintings of the Amerindians of which the significance can only be guessed, he says: "It is of course European nonsense to think that the prehistoric artists created them as a leisure activity." Of course, it is Helman's nonsense to think that modern, or even nineteenth century authors do indeed believe this.

Helman loves to describe the original inhabitants as kind, meek people who generally withdrew as soon as aggressive conquerors entered their region. On the other hand, Helman admits with pride that they did defend themselves violently and obstinately, only withdrawing when superior weapons and infectious diseases forced them to do so. In their internal territorial feuds they could be pitiless, cruel, cannibalistic warriors. But according to Helman they derived extra protein as well as mental strength from eating their slain enemy. He must also acknowledge that many Amerindians cooperated with the Europeans to fight their own opponents, or to bring in slaves. Unfortunately Helman garbles the history of the Maroons.

His description of the period after World War Two shows his great general knowledge and experience, which is not limited to his own country, Suriname. The populist Prime Minister of Suriname in the 1960s, Johan Pengel, is the subject of much abuse from Helman, who characterizes him as "... a typical West-African 'oba,' a chief, imposing only because of his obesity, his voracity, his squandering, his dictatorial manner, and his smugness." Here Helman is very unkind to West African chiefs and even only partly truthful about Pengel. The current Prime Minister of Guyana, Forbes Burnham, receives a better verdict; according to Helman, he has more intellect and instinct. That may be so, but Helman hardly mentions Burnham's clearly dictatorial and opportunistic arbitrariness. Burnham refused to intervene when arson, plundering, and murder harmed mostly the Indian population in 1964. Helman presents these facts without comments, which is quite unusual for him. He does not even elaborate on political killings, such as the murder of Walter Rodney. "Burnham cannot be denied the stature of a real statesman," Helman concludes without irony.

He sometimes confirms prejudices instead of refuting them in spite of the fact that he himself provides the evidence to the contrary; for example, he restates the old stereotype of the industriousness and thrift of the Hindustanis compared to the laziness and carelessness of the Creoles.

His description of the achievement of independence in Suriname and in Guyana is fascinating, sharp, and full of ironic comment. His analytical report of the 1980 military coup in Suriname, "this insane soldiers-government," and its gruesome aftermath is masterfully written, with contained anger, sorrow, and contempt. Helman believes he has enough indications to state that both the American CIA and the Dutch government's military mission had a hand in the coup, but that later developments went out of control of the formerly helpful advisors.

Helman has a dream. The five Guianas must be reunited. He believes that this dream can become reality because "their total integration is, for ecological, ethnic, historical, and socio-economic reasons, not only desirable but also possible." He seems to be closer to reality when he supposes that Brazil and Venezuela

have the ability to overrun Guyana, Suriname, and French Guiana whenever they want to. However, these countries would after all not give up their newly acquired territory — not to each other, not to anybody else, and certainly not to Greater Guyana.

Still, a descendant of Eldorado has offered us his testament. Read it, descendants of the usurpers and the enslaved! It is a masterful testimony, full of fascinating information, a goldmine, an eldorado.

SILVIA W. DE GROOT
Department of History
University of Amsterdam
1016 BX Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Central American English. JOHN HOLM (ed.). Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag, 1983. 184 pp. + cassette tape. (Paper US\$ 15.10, DM 36.00)

This (the second) volume in the series *Varieties of English around the World* deals with the different kinds of English and English-lexifier creoles spoken by some 250,000 people in Central America and the western Caribbean. In so doing, it provides an invaluable resource for this chain of dialects which until recently has scarcely been acknowledged in Caribbean linguistics.

The geographical areas for which discussion and texts have been assembled include Belize (by Geneviève Escure), the Bay Islands of Honduras (by Elissa Warantz), the Miskito Coast of Nicaragua (by John Holm, with a section on Rama Cay Creole by Barbara Assadi), Costa Rica and Panama (by Anita Herzfeld) and San Andres/Providencia and the Caymans (by William Washabaugh). The book is cogently introduced by Robert B. Le Page, while the first chapter, by John Holm, consists of an ethnographic survey of the entire area and an account of its historical background. Each chapter contains one or more texts, in broad phonemic orthography (although for comparative purposes a narrower representation might have been more useful), some of which are included on the cassette which accompanies the book, and each is followed by linguistic notes on different words or constructions indicated here and there throughout.

These dialects should be examined in conjunction with the volume on Jamaican (forthcoming), together with which they appear to constitute the western group of the Caribbean branch of anglophone Atlantic creoles. In the first chapter, Holm includes a discussion of creolization, which he equates with the degree of "influence from African languages" (p. 15); for example, the *be*-verb and the tense/aspect markers in the different Central American creoles are compared with those in Yoruba and Mandinka. A list is given on pp. 20–21 of some 144 randomly-selected words, most of which occur in all six of the creoles (exclusive of Caymanian) but none of which are to be found in the *Dictionary of Jamaican English*. Twenty-five of these items (about 17%), however, *do* turn up in West African Krio, a fact which remains to be explained and which underscores Le Page's caveat against attempting anything like the family-tree system of relational representation characteristic of Indo-European linguistics:

All have been influenced by comings and goings within the Caribbean as the fortunes of the region changed — a war won or lost here, a canal to be cut or fortifications to be built there ... the precise mix, the outcome to date, is different from one area to another [p. 3].

The most interesting aspect of Chapter One to this reviewer is its discussion of the consequences of linguistic contact with Spanish (compared with, say, French in parts of the eastern Caribbean); not dealt with in any detail, however, is the interaction between the different creoles and their respective varieties of metropolitan ("standard") English. Indeed, while the inhabitants of the Bay Islands and the Caymans speak dialects of English rather than Creole, some of the texts that appear here and in later volumes in the series could not strictly be considered "varieties of *English* around the world" at all.

A review of this length can hardly begin to deal with all the items that bear discussion; generally the various contributors have tended to be over-particular in their choices of African language models for different creolisms. If, for example, possessives having the form *for* + NP (e.g., *fo him jab* 'his job') have Ewe *fe* + NP as their basis (p. 110), it is odd that the construction is unknown in

Ghanaian Pidgin English, or any other West African pidgin or creole.

The creolist's cliché that *ina* 'in' is from a convergence of Igbo *na* and Portuguese *na* — the latter a contracted form of the feminine singular 'in the' — is resuscitated (p. 114) although an origin in English *in* plus acquired *-a* is likelier on several grounds (cf. Jamaican *uona* 'own').

On p. 115 Rama Cay Creole *bay* 'at (someone's house)' is suggested as a Germanism attributable to missionaries in the area a century ago who spoke that language. It may well be; there are other, undeniably German items in that particular creole, but the use is common enough in the southern Antilles too (*by we* 'at/to our house'). Should "lack of subject-auxiliary inversion" be especially noted for the same creole (p. 120) in *haw dey wi kech fish* 'how will they catch fish?' when this is a feature shared by all creoles, and would only be a "lack" in terms of English? Or is it somehow significant in this particular dialect (in which case more discussion would have been welcome)?

I'm not sure that *a na tu pahtikyula fo it kliyn* (p. 102) really means 'I'm not too particular about cleaning it.' In other creoles, this would mean rather 'I'm not too particular that it (should) be clean,' and if the interpretation given for Miskito Coast Creole is in fact correct, then some discussion of the non-creole (Spanish-influenced?) syntax is warranted.

There are a few typographical errors throughout; in the small section of the book I have restricted these comments to, I found *crecé-* (p. 107), *niño* (p. 108), and *etomoloty* (p. 113) for *crecé-*, *niño*, and *etymology*, but the most careless aspect seems to have been in the transcriptions themselves. Comparing, for example, part of the text given on page 153 with what is on the cassette, we find:

Cassette: ...ley dong an im beli wid wan reyza an bigin tu kot evribadi fut ... so a haftu biliyv.

Text: ...lay down an him bieli, reyz op an bigin tu kot evribodi fut ... se ay av tu biliyv.

These discrepancies aside, the book provides an invaluable addition to the comparative creolist's library, bringing together as it

does data on the speech of what its editor calls one of the western hemisphere's best-kept secrets — the quarter of a million anglophone creole speakers along the Central American coast. As Le Page says in his introduction, the pioneering work in this area is still being done. This book has laid a solid foundation for further linguistic study of a part of the world whose strategic importance can only continue to grow.

IAN HANCOCK

Departments of Linguistics & English
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin TX 78712, U.S.A.